REPORT RESUMES

ED 014 452 SP 001 343

MINUTES AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE CALIFORNIA COUNCIL ON THE EDUCATION OF TEACHERS (SANTA BARBARA, MARCH 30 - APRIL 1, 1967).

CALIFORNIA STATE DEPT. OF EDUCATION, SACRAMENTO

PUB DATE 1 APR 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$2.84 69P.

DESCRIPTORS- ACCREDITATION (INSTITUTIONS), COLLEGE SCHOOL COOPERATION, *CONFERENCES, CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, INNOVATION, SENSITIVITY TRAINING, STATE LEGISLATION, TEACHER CERTIFICATION, *TEACHER EDUCATION, TEACHER PROGRAMS, SANTA BARBARA CONFERENCE, CALIFORNIA

THIS REPORT CONTAINS THE MINUTES AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE 1967 SANTA BARBARA CONFERENCE ON THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS FOR CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED YOUTH. INCLUDED ARE (1) REPORTS FROM THE COMMISSIONS ON ACCREDITATION, CERTIFICATION, AND LEGISLATION, (2) REPORTS OF THE FIVE GENERAL SESSIONS HELD UNDER THE TOPIC HEADINGS (A) "A SCHOOL BOARD PRESIDENT'S VIEWS ON THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS FOR THE CULTURALLY DIFFERENT," (B) "TEACHERS' VIEWS ON PREPARATION FOR TEACHING THE CHILDREN OF THE POOR," (C) "SCHOOL-COLLEGE COOPERATION--IMPLICATIONS FOR THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS FOR THE CULTURALLY DEPRIVED," (D) "MODEL PROGRAMS--PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION," AND (E) "ANALYSIS, REACTIONS, AND NEXT STEPS," (3) REPORTS OF THE GROUP DISCUSSIONS HELD, (4) MINUTES OF THE BUSINESS MEETING, AND (5) A ROSTER OF PARTICIPANTS. (AW)

001343
SP

[redacted]

c 3^{00}

California Council on the Education of Teachers

ED014452

Minutes and Proceedings
of the Santa Barbara Conference
March 30, 31 and April 1, 1967

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CALIFORNIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
MAX RAFFERTY SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
SACRAMENTO

CALIFORNIA COUNCIL ON THE EDUCATION OF TEACHERS

Sacramento, California

TO: President Stone and Delegates to the California Council on the Education of Teachers

SUBJECT: Minutes and Proceedings of the Spring Conference held at the Miramar Hotel, Santa Barbara, March 30 and 31, April 1, 1967

Attached are the minutes and proceedings of the 1967 Santa Barbara Spring Conference. The thrust of the conference was on the preparation of teachers for children and youth who are culturally disadvantaged. It is suggested that members of the Council share these minutes and proceedings with colleagues and others interested in the education of teachers. A number of extra copies are available upon request through the Secretary's office.

Your attention is called to the next meeting of the Council, which will be held at Yosemite on October 26, 27, and 28, 1967.

Respectfully submitted,

Carl A. Larson

Carl A. Larson, Secretary

CONTENTS

Page

Commission Reports 1

Report of the First General Session: " A School Board President's Views on the Preparation of Teachers for the Culturally Different". 10

Report of the Second General Session: "Teachers' Views on Preparation for Teaching the Children of the Poor". . . 19

Reports of Group Discussions. 20

Report of the Third General Session: "School-College Cooperation: Implications for the Preparation of Teachers for the Culturally Deprived". 29

Report of the Fourth General Session: "Model Programs" . . . 37

Report of the Fifth General Session: "Analysis, Reactions, and Next Steps". 38

Business Meeting 43

Roster 53

COMMISSION REPORTS

COMMISSION REPORTS

Commission on Accreditation

Chairman: Rev. Darrell F. X. Finnegan, Loyola University of Los Angeles
Board Consultant: Francis Herrick, Western College Association, Oakland

The Commission on Accreditation met in the Gold Room of the Miramar Hotel on March 30, 10:00 a.m., with the following members present: Rev. Darrell F. X. Finnegan, S.J., Chairman; Harvey B. Snyder, Secretary; Rev. Paul J. Harney, S.J.; Lewie Burnett, Claire Pelton, James Cusick, Alden Vanderpool, Dallas Tueller, James Stone; Larry Leslie, guest.

The Chairman reported on the joint meeting of representatives from this Commission with the Committee on Accreditation of the State Board of Education held at the Airport-Mariana Hotel in Los Angeles on December 12, 1966. This was the meeting at which the Council Commission presented the suggestion for a program of workshops for the preparation of accreditation visitors. At the same meeting, Council Commission representatives outlined a proposal to secure funds to assist in the preparation of guidelines for use in evaluating the teacher preparation program of an institution. The State Committee was most receptive to these suggestions and indicated its support of the proposal.

In the next order of presentation, the Chairman reviewed the work of a day-long meeting of a subcommittee composed of representatives from both the California Council Commission and the State Board Committee on Accreditation. This meeting was held at Loyola University on January 6, 1967. Copies of the minutes from this meeting have been distributed to all members of the Commission and to other interested individuals.

Father Paul Harney, S. J., Chairman of the Committee on Accreditation of the California State Board of Education, reported on the results of his presentation to the State Board of Education concerning the following Proposals: (1) two workshops for visitors to be held next October; and (2) a plan for developing guidelines for use in evaluating programs of teacher education, including a request for approval of an application for funds from Title V of the 1965 Education Act. It was reported to the Commission that the State Board gave its approval to the proposal for two workshops for visitors to be held this next October. There was hesitancy concerning the project to develop guidelines. The Board does not want to involve the colleges in too much that is prescriptive as related to credential requirements. The reaction seemed to be that the Committee was to seek as much help as possible from as broad an area as it could, including assistance from specialists in various academic areas and from various organizations representative of subject matter fields.

The State Board seeks to understand thoroughly what accreditation is and the full meaning of the process as it affects teacher education. The Board is much concerned about any guidelines that would tend to be too restrictive for practical use in evaluating or endorsing a program for teacher preparation. If the Commission can take a little more time for a somewhat broader study of the problem and give the State Board more time to review the results of this study, it is highly probable that the Board would endorse the proposal and render assistance for the preparation of guidelines.

The next order of business was the report from Larry Leslie, University of California, who is a doctoral candidate under the direction of Dr. Stone. Mr. Leslie has been working for some time on the subject of the accreditation of teacher education in California, He read to the Commission an excellent paper which is a preliminary statement surveying the basic problems and issues around the development of criteria for the approval of teacher education programs. Copies of this paper were made available to all members of the Commission.

There was considerable discussion about the paper. It was Mr. Leslie's intention to answer, in part at least, the objections of the State Board to the Commission's proposal for the development of guidelines. This part was considered well done. It was agreed that there is definite need for the preparation of minimum standards which give us "a place to start from". As one Commission member commented, evaluation of teacher education programs require that we "learn to walk before we can run". It is admittedly true that good programs go beyond the minimum requirement. It is further evident that no institution stays frozen into a pattern but that there are always new changes and new ideas which need evaluation. Colleges should not only be allowed to keep up with change; they should be encouraged to do so.

Ever present also is the place of judgement and subjective evaluation in the process of accreditation. Should the same firm standards apply to all situations? What is the place of flexibility in college evaluation? Usually the application report portrays the minimum requirements. Almost anyone can verify these. Really under these circumstances an accreditation team would not be needed. By the same token, should a college be lead to feel that if it meets the minimum requirements -- accreditation is thereby automatic? This would not be a proper use of the accreditation process. But these questions are important and need to be answered or at least clarified.

The Commission adjourned for lunch at 12:00 noon.

In the afternoon session, the Chairman called upon Dr. Vanderpool to present two matters related to legislation directly affecting teacher preparation which the C.T.A. is presently sponsoring in the current session of the California State Legislature. Copies of both of these proposals were distributed to each member of the Commission.

The first of these is called the Professional Responsibilities Act, which is based on the concept that the profession is responsible for the preparation of its own membership. This suggested legislation provides for the structure whereby teaching, like nursing, architecture, dentistry, and so on, can have the major voice in planning for and evaluation of the professional preparation of its new members.

The second legislative proposal identified by Dr. Vanderpool is referred to as the California Internship Teacher Education Act. As the title implies, this proposal suggests a greater reliance upon a program of internship for the completion of a new teacher's preparation. Included in this legislation is a plan for financing internship at the district level.

These legislative proposals induced much discussion pro and con. No conclusions were reached nor any action taken regarding endorsement or recommendation. It should be stated that decision making was not the intention of Dr. Vanderpool in sharing these matters with the Commission. He merely wished to inform the members as to what type of interest the C.T.A. was showing in teacher education.

After a somewhat lengthy discussion of Mr. Leslie's paper and the matter of evaluation guidelines in general, the Commission moved toward a statement as to what the next steps should be. Among the several suggestions made, the following seemed to have the greatest consensus:

First, a start should be made with at least minimum standards. Many of these are spelled out in the Code. Other help can be secured from professional bodies and from specialists in the subject matter areas. Information from a great variety of sources needs to be collected and organized for study. The State Board is most willing that information concerning what the professional bodies and subject matter specialists consider minimum standards be disseminated.

Secondly, in the light of the Board's present disinclination to sponsor a document of this kind, the Commission feels that any criteria and guidelines which have been or will be developed should be stated in the form of "recommendations" and should be regarded as being offered by the California Council on the Education of Teachers. (It is assumed that the institutions would have had a chance to study them and give their reactions before any publication.) If the guidelines are portrayed as coming not just from "national organizations" but from California's teacher education institutions as a group, and if they are portrayed as having been developed through sharing with all the professional elements that have a direct interest in teacher education, then the objections raised by the State Board will, no doubt, be greatly reduced. Perhaps at some later date the Board might wish to adopt the recommendations, but meanwhile the institutions in the state and the accreditation teams would have a usable document and would realize that it had grown out of a consensus of their peers.

It was agreed that if the details can be properly worked out, Mr. Leslie would continue his study of this problem and move along in this general direction for the next several months.

Under the supposition that he will be able to obtain permission to use this subject for his doctoral dissertation, Mr. Leslie plans to obtain more materials and to devote nearly full time to the topic, beginning with the fall quarter. He hopes to complete his task by June, 1968. Dr. Vanderpool stated that because the C.T.A. is so interested in this topic, he felt he could obtain for Mr. Leslie the secretarial and clerical assistance necessary to his work. The Chairman of the Commission also promised to explore the possibility of some financial assistance from the Council.

Since there appears to be no chance of the State Board requesting the federal money as proposed in the budget submitted, it is hoped that Arthur Corey (or someone of comparable stature), upon the completion of the project, evaluate all the materials in the document. This step would be followed by the proposed state meeting of subject matter specialists to obtain their views. The document would then be submitted to the teacher education institutions in the state for their emendations and suggestions. Finally, under the aegis of the Council, it would be published.

Commission on Certification

Acting Chairman: Larry Jones, California Association of School Administrators
Board Consultant: Carl Larson, State Department of Education, Sacramento

Commission members attending the meeting were Rebekah Stromgren, George Gumeson, William Glenn, and Larry Jones. Guests included Louise Bachtold, Charles Hamilton, and J. Alden Vanderpool. Consultants to the meeting were Carl Larson and Eli Obradovich. The Commission sessions were held from 10:00 in the morning until 4:45 in the afternoon, March 30.

The following matters were discussed, and recommendations for Council action were approved as indicated:

1. Removal of academic-nonacademic distinction. It is recommended that the Council support A. B. 605, Milias, but that it urge modification of the bill to extend the removal to all credentials, and the substitution of "subjects taught".

2. The issuance of separate credentials for special education (physically and mentally handicapped), eliminating the academic major requirement and limiting service to the special education field. It is recommended that the Council strongly support A. B. 87, Greene, which will satisfactorily accomplish this.

3. The five year teaching requirement for the administrative credential. It is recommended that the Council seek a study of the effect of this requirement to determine if modification is warranted. One suggested alternate which might be generally acceptable would be three years of teaching and two years of administration.

4. The overall requirements for the supervision-administration credentials. In addition to the five-year teaching requirement, there are repeated expressions of concern regarding the academic major, the overall 90-unit requirement, and the effect of these requirements on the supply of qualified persons in these fields. It is suggested that the Council might wish to undertake or to seek institutional assistance in a thorough study of these matters.

5. S. B. 65, Alquist, would eliminate all credential requirements for California junior colleges. It is recommended that the Council oppose S. B. 65 as not in the best interest of junior college education.

6. Renewal of partial fulfillment credentials by meeting requirements as specified by the State Department of Education. There is evidence of great confusion here which may well result in the

abandonment of the entire concept. The Commission is convinced that the concept has real merit, and the Council is urged to seek the removal of those institutional hurdles which are currently contributing to the defeat of the program developed by the State Department. (Some institutions will not certify their own extension courses as satisfying the requirements for renewal of partial fulfillment credentials.)

7. A. B. 451 and A. B. 452, Ryan, would replace the present State Department of Education Credentials Committee with one composed primarily of classroom teachers. Your Credentials Commission feels that this is, in truth, an administrative function and that it should be retained within the State Department. It is recommended that the Council oppose those proposals.

The following matters were discussed, but no recommendations for action were forthcoming:

1. The staying of the escalation clause for the standard secondary credential. The State Board of Education acted favorably upon the recommendation of its Committee that the line be held firm for 1967-1968, and that authorization to use again the provisional credential procedure be immediately re-enacted.

2. S. B. 265, Harmen, which would, as we understand it, again establish education as an acceptable major. The members of the Commission would, individually, oppose such a move.

3. Credential simplification. We were informed that there are now 640 different channels through which one may seek one or another of the many credentials.

4. C.T.A. representatives presented and interpreted a rationale for a Professional Responsibilities Act which would transfer the policy-making function for both certification and accreditation from the State Board and place it in the hands of a new Committee composed primarily of public school teachers.

5. C.T.A. representatives presented and explained a Teacher Licensure Internship proposal.

   (Note: Items four and five above are still under study by C.T.A. but may soon become firm legislative proposals.)

6. Preparation and assignment of teacher aides, assistants, and the like. State Department representatives indicated there is a serious need for clarification in this area.

7. Upper and lower division credit. Differences between institutions in the classification of such credit is causing serious problems in the State Department.

Commission on Legislation

Chairman: Aubrey Berry, California Educational Placement Association
Board Consultant: Olaf Tegner, Pepperdine College, Los Angeles

The personnel attending this meeting were Aubrey Berry, Chairman; Jane Cavenagh, Maurice L. Crawford, Norman S. Lien, Gilbert S. Moore, H. Orville Nordberg, Frederick Quinlan, and Olaf Tegner. Gilbert Moore was a consultant to the meeting in addition to the board consultant. The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m., March 30, in the Miramar Hotel.

In the first order of business, the Chairman read communications pertaining to the status of CCET.

Amendments to the following legislative bills were then reviewed: AB 7, 65, 376; SB 19, 64, 65. It was decided that these amendments were not adequate and that there should be no change in the previous action taken by this Commission.

Orville Nordberg reported on a conference held by the administrative assistant for Senator Harmer on SB 265 with division chairmen of the state colleges. He stated that the division chairmen advised that the bill should be amended for the following reasons:

1. There should not be four-year training programs for both elementary and secondary teachers.
2. Secondary teachers should have a five-year training program; elementary teachers, a four-year program.
3. There should be no distinction between academic and nonacademic majors. Decision to employ should rest with the local board of education.
4. There should be flexibility in training programs rather than prescription.

The following legislative bills were discussed by the Commission:

AB 451 (Ryan, et al.): Changes in Composition of Committee of Credentials

Action: Oppose

Reasons: 1. Professional administrators with long experience and working in the State Department of Education are more qualified and accountable. An outside committee diffuses responsibility.

2. There is a question whether or not justice will be better served under this bill. Protects the defendant relative to confidential information but not the committee, or plaintiff, via the defendant.

AB 698 (Milias): Tutition for Higher Education

Action: Oppose

Reasons:
1. Diversion of students to junior colleges may reduce lower division enrollments and increase upper division enrollments, which are more costly.
2. Master Plan (Donahoe Act) calls for free higher education; this bill reverses this principle.
3. Might be a handicap to capable, culturally disadvantaged, and those who face financial problems because of their hesitancy to commit themselves to a financial obligation.
4. If enrollments decrease, may affect recruitment of personnel for the professions.
5. Would immediately place a financial obligation and burden upon the junior college districts of the state.

AB 979 (Ryan, et al.): Confidential Information

Action: Oppose

Reasons:
1. This bill would prevent research through the restriction of data and the necessary information needed for evaluation.
2. It would prevent the securing of pre-employment information for persons being considered for positions in education.
3. Prevents securing information about pupils and/or students for educational purposes and for the prevention of juvenile delinquency.
4. Would place an insurmountable load upon the courts.

SB 265 (Harmer): Revision of Requirements for Credentials

Action: Support with amendments

Amend:
1. The bill should carry a definition of what is meant by "fifth year"; i.e., a minimum of 24 semester units in excess of the requirements for a baccalaureate degree.
2. Delete the seven-year completion requirement -- exceptions to be handled by special action.
3. Delete references to majors in education or educational methodology and substitute "fields not commonly taught" in elementary and secondary schools.

(Note: The CCET supports the bill relative to there being no distinction between academic and nonacademic majors.)

SB 444 (Lagomarsino): Changing of Credential Requirements Sooner Than Four Years

Action: Oppose for the present

Reason:
1. Seems to place unnecessary restrictions on the actions of the State Board of Education.
2. As stated, the effects of, and reasons for, the bill are not clear. The CCET invites clarification.

REPORT

# of the

FIRST GENERAL SESSION

REPORT OF THE FIRST GENERAL SESSION

Address of the Session

"A School Board President's Views on the Preparation of Teachers for the Culturally Different"

--Alfred W. Newman, President, Board of Education, Vallejo Unified School District

When Dr. Stone invited me several months ago to speak to you tonight, I understood from him that my topic would be what a school board expects of a new teacher in an inner core school. I went to work with enthusiasm. Sometimes desires and hopes are all too easily verbalized. Therefore, so that my Walter-Mitty-like thoughts do not become lost, I have summarized as follows the desirable characteristics of this mythical teacher you are sending to us:

1. Obviously the teacher must have a basic competency to teach. The preparation and certification to teach must come about because of, or in spite of, compliance with the Fisher bill. Over and above this, the teacher should possess certain personal qualities which are listed here.

2. The love for every single child and--with apologies to Lawrence Clark Powell--the lust to teach them all.

3. The willingness to accept any assignment, regardless of the risk to personal health or safety, and a willingness to accept students in any number and in varying states of personal cleanliness. The candidate must have the vigor and enthusiasm of youth, must never get married or leave the profession; but of course such exuberance and dedication must be coupled with the maturity, judgment, and tolerance that stem from a full life, a family, and a happy marriage.

4. There must be a complete indifference to salaries or interest in teacher organizations striving for better working conditions through pressure tactics.

5. The ability to implement the policy decisions of an omniscient school board and to accept the regulations and procedures of an omnipotent administrative staff exactly as written is desired, except when they're wrong.

6. An unbounded optimism that every child is teachable and has the ability to learn notwithstanding hunger, health problems, or family indifference is a minimum requirement, for what we really expect is the teacher's ability to prove that that optimism is justified.

7. Lastly, the board expects this teacher to accept change and challenge without grumble, hesitation, or second thought.

Somehow you produce these traits which I sincerely believe do exist in large measure in our new teachers. How you do it remains a mystery to me.

Frankly, it would be presumptuous of me to speak of the technical aspects of teacher training curricula. I do not know enough to attempt the task, nor do I know enough to make any meaningful contribution. Instead, I have determined to speak to you of several fundamental needs, as I see them, which I believe are connected with the adequate training of teachers for the culturally different. Whether or not these are basic needs will be left inevitably to your judgment. The attempt, then, will be really to identify challenges, not to produce answers.

These will be my themes:

1. The need to instill in your students an understanding of the basic objectives of education

2. The need to instill an awareness of the facts inherent in the task of reaching our culturally different and to impart a sensitivity to basic communication ability

3. Thirdly, and more pertinent to your group, a plea that we need somehow to increase both the speed and breadth of the dissemination of the results of research and experience, both formal and informal

You may properly wonder how these themes tie in with the teaching of the culturally different. My response is to express a deep-seated belief that with the culturally different children lie both the hope and the challenge inherent in the long-range success of your institutions. Should you feel that these themes have some applicability to all teacher training, so much the better from my standpoint; for is not the real task that of eliminating the culturally different, insofar as the term has a negative connotation? Is not the task with which this conference is dealing that of getting every child into the main stream of the American culture?

I. The Basic Objective

How widespread generally is the understanding of the ultimate objective of education? Is there even a common acceptance of what that objective really is? It would seem logical that teachers in particular should teach at all times and at all levels from some basic premises dealing with what they are trying to do and what the real goal is.

It seems to me that the ultimate job of any system of education in any state is that of preserving the form of government in which it operates. Such was true in Plato's republic; it was true in the dictatorships that have challenged us over our lifetimes; and it is equally true in our own country.

We in this country can be thankful that this is the task. For we also have as fundamental creeds that there should be equal educational opportunity for all, and that each individual should be permitted to rise to the full measure of his or her capacity. Each of you assembled here should be justly proud of the contribution that free public education has made toward the realization of our American dreams. Certainly there was political genius at work in the drafting of the Declaration of Independence and of the Constitution. But is it not a hard fact that neither one of these would have had much chance to remain a fundamental governing document unless we had evolved in the mid-nineteenth century our general system of free public education? One system open to all, supported financially by the entire body politic, and largely unique in the world.

If we admit that political genius was the cornerstone, certainly we must admit that our educational system was the key buttress. Washington perhaps foresaw this need for such a system when he said, "In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion be enlightened."

What is the situation today?

Our country, on the one hand, has outstripped all others in technology and in the material standards we enjoy. Certainly education has contributed to these fruits. But it is equally true that our country has produced disparities among individual groups, one of which groups is the theme of your conference. The questions are whether some failure in our system of education produced these disparities and, if there was or was not any such failure, whether our system of education can be of assistance in eliminating them.

In the culturally different group I assume that we are dealing with children not in the main stream of American culture for whatever reason. Let us review some of the characteristics of this group.

First of all, we note the geographical concentration of the culturally different, or at least we are aware of that concentration. Most of our big cities are now half or more out of the norm, and the greater percentage of their school children fall within the definition of the disadvantaged.

Bloom, Davis, and Hess, in Compensatory Education for Cultural Deprivation, sum up both the fact of recent social change and the needs created by it in reflecting that ours is "a rapidly developing, complex, urban, industrial society which requires that functioning members of this society be highly literate, responsible to rapid changes in every area of life and work, and able to learn and relearn complex ideas and skills as minimal conditions for economic security, social maturity, and independence."

These authorities find other basic changes sufficient to induce them to call the whole a revolution--in rising levels of aspiration, in increased responsiveness of government to the pressures of subgroups, and lastly, in the fact that our very success in solving basic material needs has heightened the desire of individuals for personal identity and better interpersonal relations.

Whether by reason of these changes or an awareness of them, more and more of us feel concern about what is happening to our culturally different. The incidents at Watts and Hunter's Point, the hippies, rising crime rates, lack of respect for property and individual rights, and all the other headline-generating situations we read about daily are among these. However, some of the disparities are not derived from the concentration of urbanization or even from poverty. A fellow board member from Fort Bragg told me that a recent survey of the children in the three primary grades in his district disclosed that 42 percent had never journeyed outside the immediate vicinity of Fort Bragg.

The problems represented by various concentrations are not the only concerns of school board members. We are more deeply troubled as to why we have had so many recent failures in override and bond elections; how we ever permitted districts to remain solely dependent, over and above state aid, on the real property tax base; how we ever permitted finance formulas to become so complicated that few, if any, can understand them, let alone find any logic behind them. How briefly did we, or others with us, fail to maintain the desire and the image of first things first, especially that of quality education for all? In the context of the subject of your conference, then, and as a school board member, I would ask if the possible failures of the system which resulted in the disparities might not have even greater implications.

If you share the feeling of unease that some, at least, feel about these conditions, I am sure that you would agree to sharing the responsibility for overcoming it.

In your influence on the existing teachers and those to come, should not there be instilled an understanding of the real value of our educational system? Should not the 200,000 teachers and educators in California be the leaders in this struggle? To do so, they need to have the facts and to know the challenge.

What has this to do with the preparation of the teachers of the culturally different? It seems to me that the failure to meet these challenges, the failure to put our house in order, could possibly deprive us of the chance to do what we must do.

Take, for example, the January, 1967, proposal contained in the third report of the U. S. Chamber of Commerce Task Force on Economic Growth and Opportunity. It is a proposal for "competitive education" expressed in the following terms:

> "Competition with existing public school systems offers a promising means of improving both public and private education. If all parents, at every income level, could choose between sending their children to approved private schools at public expense, both public and private education would improve as schools attempted to attract and hold pupils. Businessmen should press for the fullest possible consideration of proposals designed to enhance competition in education. Local, state, and federal governments should consider legislation which would enable communities to adopt programs establishing a public-private option for all children. Universities and educational associations should sponsor symposiums to explore the advantages, appropriate procedures, and possible pitfalls of establishing educational competition."

Need I add that this particular recommendation is viewed as heresy by many school board members? The not illogical extension of it to the field of teacher training is to have industry take over the preparation of teachers for service in either the public or private schools. We have already seen industry offer to train, by contract, some of those who have dropped out or have been pushed out of our traditional schools. In some cases these offers have been accepted.

That Chamber report, incidentally, addresses itself wholly to the education of the disadvantaged poor, and there are many items and proposals in the report that you will find at least of interest, if not of actual value.

Before leaving this matter of giving primacy to the ultimate objective of education, mention must be made of the special situation of the racial minority children of our state, now numbering 25 percent of the public school a.d.a. in California. That the number is this great and that the concentration is in the urban centers were suggested by the school boards study of 1964 and confirmed by the recent mandated state census. To a large extent these youngsters are outside the main stream although they do not make up the whole of the culturally different group.

Again, without attempting to give recognition to the special techniques that may be required to reach this particular group, I should like to make a plea that your institutions lay out the problem and the attendant facts to all of your trainees. I have reached the conclusion, although I can't fully document it, that it is as important to America's long-range goals that the children of the majority race have an integrated experience as it is for children of the minority races. You know the research as well as I--that when a minority race youngster is moved into a properly programmed, integrated situation, his achievement goes up, and the achievement of the white youngsters does not suffer. In the larger view--that of the fulfillment of the American dream--is it not obvious that we must integrate? Yet the fact remains, for all the concern and all the efforts of the civil right activists, that de facto segregation in the urban centers seems to be on the increase, not on the decrease.

How do we change this trend in a democratic way, even though we may be motivated solely for the purpose of educational advantage to the youngsters? How do we change the thinking of the people as shown by the vote on Proposition 14, or by the widespread resistance by parents of all races to any move away from our traditional neighborhood schools? My own board, for example, is by no means unanimous on a way to integrate. We all see a need to do so. I am sorry to say that I don't think we've had any significant success in changing deep-seated community attitudes favoring the status quo. Are there possibilities in this area in the preparation of teachers--and of all teachers--not just those of the culturally different? Should they become the leaders, along with you and me, in a movement dictated by sound educational practice and consistent with our American dream? The teachers can become a potent force through their own efforts and through their own teaching. When the case to integrate is sold on the basis of the educational need to do so, then and only then will community attitude change.

In summary, it seems to me that a fundamental appreciation and understanding of the goal of education is a basic part of the training of all teachers, not just those of the culturally different. If my idea of our educational goal doesn't square with yours, or if the facts as you see them lead you to different conclusions, may I suggest you offer your own goals and that we strive for common agreement on them? But whatever you do, give us new teachers who have some fundamental goals in mind over and above their competency in specified subject areas or in methodology.

II. An Awareness of and Sensitivity to Facts and Communications Skills

Thus far, what I have said is obviously applicable to the training of all teachers, not just the teachers of the disadvantaged. As regards the training of teachers for the culturally different children, what I have observed indicates that the teacher's desire to teach them is an integral element of success in doing so. In other words, the attitude of the teacher is extremely important. I do not know particularly how proper attitudes can be developed or how the desire to teach these children can be instilled. I have even heard discussed whether some of the success of ESEA programs is attributable to the feeling of participating in experimentation--the so-called Hawthorne effect--and that the programs will suffer when the novelty wears off. On the optimistic side, the American trait of wanting to meet challenges may be working for us. Perhaps if the challenge is made dramatic enough, solutions will be found.

Over and above desire and attitude is the matter of understanding the facts that make for cultural difference. All in this room have heard the charge that our fundamental difficulty lies in the fact that our schools are both taught and run by middle-class Americans, but that one-half of our market, the pupils, are from an alien group which neither shares our aspirations nor starts with the basic family endeavor to get the child ready to learn and to keep him at it when he has started. Certainly an understanding of these children is a must.

Let me bring the need to know the facts a little closer to home. In 1961 and 1962 the Vallejo Unified School District enjoyed the benefits of a Rosenberg Foundation Grant to work with some of our disadvantaged children. A particular attempt was made to gain contact and to work with the parents of these children. Among other tasks, the staff wanted to find out why the quality of homework from many children in this group seemed to be so poor. One of the immediate discoveries was the absence in the homes of these children of any notion that providing the child with a regular table and chair for study purposes might have some bearing on school work. In some cases the physical items were lacking, even the kitchen table being too heavily engaged for this use. Simply suggesting this fact and setting up a study hall in a vacant house in the subdivision brought some immediate results. A knowledge of the facts, then, is always the starting point for solving a problem.

Next is the matter of the ability to communicate with these children and how to teach them to communicate with us and with others. The difficulty extends all the way from the inability to verbalize to problems of dialect. The National Council of Teachers of English published some interesting findings in its 1965 report entitled Language Programs for the Disadvantaged. One finding in the area of teacher preparation is that "there is a widespread lack of fit between teacher's preparation--personal, academic, professional--and the demands of teaching disadvantaged children. Fully certificated and experienced teachers find themselves frustrated, their expectations disappointed, traditional materials ineffective."

The report makes a good case for the need of all teachers of their children to be knowledgeable about the structure of language and language learning. It also recommends that the preparation work for the teacher of the disadvantaged include the fields of cultural anthropology and urban sociology, among other behavioral sciences.

We must be able to communicate, we must want to communicate with these children and to teach them to be able to communicate with us and with others. And that includes the ability to call a spade a spade when we should do so.

Before leaving the area of knowing the facts and overcoming language barriers, may I make a plea, also, that somehow we get across to these teachers--and indeed to all teachers--the fact that they are the most vital cog in any school district's community relations program? It is like my own profession. If I mention the word "court," I suspect many of you think of the United States Supreme Court. This tribunal takes up to perhaps a hundred cases a year. The real contact of the people and the impressions gotten about our courts do not come from impressions about that august body, but rather with the treatment received at the hands of our local district and municipal court judges in connection with traffic tickets and small claims actions. In some of these courts a hundred items may be handled in one day. This goes on in a community. So many of the negative impressions are created by lack of knowledge of the total picture and by lack of communication among people.

In the field of education, the teachers, along with the clerks and the custodians, are the ones who are in contact with the parents. They are the ones who, day in and day out, have the opportunity to sell the goals of education, to explain our programs, and indirectly to ensure the passage of override tax and school bond measures. For example, in a recent bond drive a parent asked me very pointed questions as to whether a set of wooden blocks to teach arithmetic cost $38.50 as a teacher had both claimed and complained. The business office later told me that the cost figure was correct. Unfortunately the teacher had failed to mention to the parent the other components of the kit or the study guides and outline which came with it. My personal observation is that, all too often, there is a lack of understanding of this task of community relations. Not infrequently I have seen examples that cause me to wonder if the preparation of teachers includes any real work in sociological behavior, in the very real and important human function of relating well and communicating effectively with other people in a community.

III. The Dissemination and Spread of Research

My last theme raises the question of what can be done to speed up the dissemination of material from new research or practical experience. It is not an easy job.

Your institutions perhaps find it easier to put the benefits of research to work in the preparation of your own students. But how rapidly are you learning what others are doing, and how rapidly do you make changes indicated by your findings? For example, how much do your institutions know about the findings of the various McAteer Act projects, more than 14 in number now, which have been funded over the past two years in California? In this connection, the

U. S. Chamber Task Force report I referred to earlier recommends the establishment of a national clearing house for the collection and dissemination of information about programs involved, and approaches taken, with "culturally different" children. It recommends that this be done under government contract with one of the universities or by the federal Office of Education itself. Perhaps this is needed, although lesser measures might achieve the same result. Is the idea good?

And how do we disseminate the material to the Legislature so that poor laws dealing with curricula or certification can be changed? Time after time legislators have said to us, "Why didn't you tell us what was needed? No one did, so we tried to solve a problem we found to exist."

At this point I do want to offer the suggestion that where you have legislative recommendations, you try to enlist the aid of organizations such as the School Boards Association, C.A.S.A., and other educational organizations to get the job done. The education family needs to speak with one voice. C.S.B.A., I believe, would be anxious to help. In fact, we ourselves are dedicated do-gooders, and we may even have some entrees and approaches to our legislators not enjoyed by you.

And the dissemination of material to the current teaching profession is critical. What do we do about inservice training? It would take a long time, a generation of teachers for a minimum, to make changes in this state if we deal with the problem only through your new teacher preparation. Even then, it would be hopeless to try to do it through your output alone so long as that output continues to be only half of the input of the new teachers in the state. Somehow I feel that the districts and your institutions must share the responsibility in regard to the existing teachers, that together we must get the districts which employ these teachers into meaningful contact with your skills. How successful have we been in this endeavor? Well, as you know, every Title I ESEA project was required to have an inservice training component. Yet only five percent of the funds or emphasis was devoted to this purpose in the first year of the program. One must believe in the need for inservice training, for almost by definition we would not otherwise have the problem beyond the primary grades which these programs are intended to solve.

The paucity of funds and the lack of emphasis given to inservice training is best understood when one remembers that the funds made available under ESEA to each pupil qualifying for the program equaled roughly half the average annual a.d.a. expenditure per child, or about $250 per youngster. The preschool and other special programs were often even more costly, amounting sometimes to twice the average annual pupil cost for normal programs. What does this point to? Two things--that money is available; secondly, that individual school districts are anxious and willing to find help from among you. In fact, if there is anyone here who would like a new job and who can write "innovative and exemplary" programs without describing them in terms of "innovative and exemplary," I would welcome a chance to meet with such a person after this program.

What may the solutions be? As a group, perhaps your institutions can sell or at least expend your many talents on a more organized basis. Perhaps you need to offer specific programs designed to teach the skills needed to the existing teachers. Perhaps a way can be found under existing laws for districts to pay their teachers to return to your campuses for full quarters or semesters to get the training job done. Every sizable district in the state has some premium built into its salary schedule for additional units. Do we need to offer special bonuses for particular courses and a commitment to teach the culturally different? And if we should do this, will you have the courses for them? Perhaps your institutions would like to take on the complete task of staffing and running one of the schools near your campus where the culturally different are concentrated. City College of New York, I'm told, has made just such an offer, and the idea may not be as far-fetched as it might first appear. It may lead to competition in the sense that the U. S. Chamber report uses the term.

Conclusion

Much of what I have said may have struck you as having a negative tone. Let me summarize on a positive note and give recognition to the tremendous strides which you, and hopefully the children concerned, are making. The ESES evaluation for the state indicates that the children given the program are achieving to their calendar age, although not progressing with the state norm. Prior to the program, these youngsters fell farther and farther behind. It is probably truer than we recognize that we do not have some new problem with the culturally different; rather, we are more aware of already existing proglems, more concerned about them, and more desirous of solving them. The very forces that have led to this awareness, concern, and desire may well have been our very own determination and the product of our very own efforts. To the extent that this is true represents a real hope. The only real problem is to ensure that you experts and we laymen are allowed to solve the problems of the culturally different within the existing framework. Ours is still the know-how, and ours is still the best system. That we need to keep that system, that we need to put that know-how to work is the essence of my plea.

REPORT

# of the

SECOND GENERAL SESSION

THE SECOND GENERAL SESSION
(Capsule Summary)

Theme of the Session:

"Teachers' Views on Preparation for Teaching the Children of the Poor"

The Second General Session of the CCET Spring Conference was held in the Miramar Room, March 31, from 1:45 p.m. to approximately 3:00 p.m. Walter Schroeder, member of the Board of Directors, presided.

The theme of effective preparation for teachers of the culturally deprived was assigned to a major session of the conference because of the growing importance of this area of instruction in California and throughout the nation.

Moderator for this special session was Claire Pelton, secondary teacher from Los Altos. Members of the discussion panel were Tarney Baldinger, secondary teacher from Compton; Donald Bolton, secondary teacher from Brentwood; Lane Francis, elementary teacher from San Jose; Robert Page, elementary teacher from Compton; and Earl Seidman, secondary teacher from Palo Alto.

The talks given by the panel discussants served as springboards to the group discussions that were held after the general session. The stimulating talks were received with enthusiasm. The session participants took ample notes, exchanged ideas, and went to the group meetings well equipped.

Because of faulty recording, it was not possible to transcribe the details of the speeches and comments that were made during this gathering. However, minutes of the group discussions are reported in the sections that follow.

REPORTS

OF

GROUP DISCUSSIONS

REPORTS OF GROUP DISCUSSIONS:
"Teachers' Views on Preparation for Teaching the Children of the Poor"

Group 1

Discussion Leader: Piroja Shroff, California College of Arts and Crafts, Oakland
Resource Consultant: Donald Bolton, Secondary Teacher, Brentwood
Recorder: Barbara Lingenfelter

It was the consensus of this group that no basic change in the credential structure is needed in the preparation of teachers for the disadvantaged. It is in the implementation of preservice requirements, however, that modification is necessary. For example, the utilization of the public school as a laboratory where methodology courses can be taught is advocated. Taking the students out of the "ivory tower" and putting them in the context of the "main stream" during their learning program is considered most important.

The group also agreed that it is of the greatest importance that school districts in the state commit themselves more thoroughly to the training of teachers. In other words, the districts should cooperate to a fuller extent by providing classroom "lab" situations and personnel in the training of students for teaching the disadvantaged. The public schools should take more initiative than they have in extending invitations to teacher training institutions to use their facilities and their personnel.

The members of the group felt that more effort should be made to develop in students a real awareness of the needs and characteristics of the disadvantaged pupil and his community.

Group 2

Discussion Leader: Larry L. Jones, California Association of School Administrators, Ventura
Resource Consultant: Lane Francis, Elementary Teacher, San Jose
Recorder: Rebekah Stromgren, California School Boards Association, Davis

The following ideas, concepts, proposals, and other matters were presented and discussed during the group meeting:

1. The basic preparation, or approximately 75 per cent of the preparation program for the culturally deprived, could be the same as the regular program
2. Should the sociology instruction be updated? Teachers need more depth in sociology to gain a better understanding of the realities of life; e.g., a study of the culture of poverty.

3. Teachers must know the environment from which their students come.

4. Teachers should know the differences that exist among cultures and should develop a better understanding of what can be accepted and what can be discarded.

5. Better screening and selection procedures should be developed. Trainees should have a large supply of human warmth, kindness, and respect for people and enthusiasm for things.

6. Greater emphasis should be placed on health and hygiene.

7. Trainees should be in the field earlier and should spend more time in the classroom. Moreover, observation is not enough; there should be more participation.

8. What can be learned from the Peace Corps and the military programs that prepare their personnel to live in foreign environments?

9. How are agriculture and home economics teachers trained to lift their students to a higher level.

10. Teachers should be sensitive to cultural variables.

11. A fuller, richer background should be given to all teachers so that they will be prepared to recognize the variability of traditions and customs through music, literature, family relationship, foods, holidays, festivals and religious traditions.

12. Teachers must be flexible in adapting the curriculum to fit the needs of the child. Rigid training and mandated books are inappropriate.

13. What is the main stream of American life? Middle-class cultures are different, and some middle-class students are deprived. Should instruction be the same, or should it be geared to meet differential needs?

14. The more we learn, the more we specialize. Each classroom will have more and more specialist in the future.

15. Are we trying to eliminate poverty, change mores, or understand mores? Above all else, we are trying to inculcate and gain acceptance of a nationwide American culture?

Group 3

Discussion Leader: Sister Rosemarie Julie, College of Notre Dame, Belmont
Resource Consultant: Tarney Baldinger, Secondary Teacher, Brentwood
Recorder: Harry Singer, University of California, Riverside

The main emphasis or theme of this group exchange of ideas was involvement. The following means were suggested for getting involved in the work of guiding and teaching deprived children:

1. Adaptation of present programs by direct confrontation and by early contact with educationally disadvantaged children.

2. Identifying, selecting, or recruiting individuals who are sincerely interested in teaching the educationally disadvantaged.

3. Structuring the experience of these individuals so that they can be successful.

In regard to number three above, it is important that the student teacher be aligned with the objectives of the program, which include the following: emphasis to be placed on the understanding of cultural backgrounds; flexibility of course work and schedules; ways of changing administrative structure; ways of adapting curriculum and materials; following teachers into post-training; utilizing feedback from teachers.

Innovation was brought forward as an important factor. Supportive of involvement, innovation should "somehow bring the community into the program". Certain specifics were recommended, such as (1) adding community workers to the ranks of the school staff; (2) helping teachers to become really aware of the community and its resources; (3) exploring the uses of television; (4) making closer examination of courses that would fit the students' present needs -- for example, a course on movie appreciation.

It was suggested that all of these things be organized into a pilot project that would utilize an interdisciplinary approach and harness community resources.

Group 4

Discussion Leader: William Wagner, California Association for Student Teaching, San Jose
Resource Consultant: Robert Page, Elementary Teacher, Compton
Recorder: Sister Jerome, Immaculate Heart College, Los Angeles

The goals of the process of education were identified, in general, as (1) individual development; (2) social stability; and (3) economic productivity.

Suggested first as a reason for our failure to realize these goals in educating the disadvantaged was the opposition to change and to innovation within the school system itself. This opposition is particularly evident in the prescription of textbooks and curricula which in some cases are most unsuitable for disadvantaged students, and in the lack of freedom on the part of individual districts or schools to spend funds as they deem fit. Opposition or indifference to change on the part of experienced teachers was also cited as a source of discouragement to teaching candidates who are eager to try new educational procedures.

SUGGESTION NO. 1

Regarding this problem of resistance to change: in addition to the obvious need for greater autonomy on the part of individual districts and schools in the matter of curricula and finance, it was suggested that the preparation of the future teacher emphasize the educational experience in terms of process rather than product and that this preparation also orientate the future teacher to the factor of change as an ever-present element in modern society.

Cited as the second obstacle to the effective education of the disadvantaged was the difficulty of motivating students who have been excluded because of racial or cultural barriers and who have developed a subculture of their own with values at odds with those of the general focus of public education.

SUGGESTION NO. 2

The difficulties and tensions involved in teaching the disadvantaged should be presented honestly to the teaching candidate. But more important, he should be encouraged to become involved in the culturally deprived community as early as possible in his college years. Such involvement is a ready basis for concern and commitment--two indispensable qualities for the teacher of the disadvantaged if he is to work effectively with these students and so remain in their schools, which are all too obviously in need of a stable, committed teaching staff.

Named as a third obstacle to the realization of our goals was the failure to employ the resources at hand to the fullest advantage.

SUGGESTION NO 3.

One proposal for encouraging maximum use of the school potential in culturally disadvantaged areas was to promote, through both inservice and preservice education, the concept of the community school. It was also suggested that teachers consider occasionally moving outside the confines of the classroom per se into a more immediate community setting since there is frequently a basic alienation between the disadvantaged family and the school. In view of these suggestions, it would seem advisable to orientate the future teacher toward a concept of education in terms of the family, not just in terms of the single child in the classroom.

The group seemed to agree that no matter what steps are taken to improve the education of teachers for the disadvantaged, it is evident that effective teaching in any area should be marked by openness and responsiveness to the people and the situation at hand. As with all teachers, it is imperative that those who work with the disadvantaged have adequate preparation in attitudes, experience, and techniques. Moreover, in conjunction with the teaching experience itself, good inservice programs should be provided for teachers in this area, preferably offered by the educational institutions since they are more adequately staffed for such a program than are most school districts.

Lastly, it was admitted that although we must acknowledge at present a major weakness in our education of the disadvantaged, still the history of the American educational system is one of meeting the needs of each new era in our social development and, hopefully, this trend will continue in the face of the challenge offered us by the disadvantaged student.

Group 6

Discussion Leader: Lewie Burnett, California State College, Hayward
Resource Consultant: Melvin Myler, California Western University, San Diego

Models or guidelines to be used in the preparation of personnel who will teach children of the poor should be based on the following assumptions:

1. That the candidates must be committed to helping this type of disadvantaged child.
2. That some candidates, professors, and even experienced teachers do not have this commitment.
3. That if the candidates are going to be successful, they must:
    a. Get feedback and assistance on how to work with these children.
    b. Examine their won values and assumptions.
    c. Change their behavior while working with these children.
    d. Develop the ability to listen to these children.
4. That the professors (or teachers of teachers) must:
    a. Learn to listen to their students.
    b. Re-examine their own commitments and behavior.
5. That experienced teachers need appropriate help as well as a whole reorientation program.
6. That effective curricula and appropriate curriculum materials are scarce.

The following practical guidelines were suggested:

1. Experimental screening procedures should be continued throughout the training program.
2. Extended experiences, running throughout the program, should include direct involvement in the communities of disadvantaged people.
3. College instruction should be enriched by the use of dropouts, neighborhood workers, and minority group representatives.
4. Candidates should be taught how to develop their own teaching materials when existing materials are inadequate.

5. Professors committed to these programs should expand the area of their personal experiences to include contact with, and firsthand knowledge of, underprivileged schools and communities.

6. The teacher education curricula in this field should be flexible and very adaptable to the needs of the candidates and the needs of disadvantaged pupils.

Group 8

Discussion Leader: Richard Jamgochian, University of California, Santa Barbara
Resource Consultant: Peggy Newgarten, California State College, Los Angeles
Recorder: Gerald Person, San Diego State College, San Diego

The development of a model program for the preparation of teachers of the culturally deprived is a most complex task. One of the problems confronted by this group was its own diversification--14 interested individuals from many parts of California. But the participants found that they were able to give realistic consideration to the theme of the session as they envisioned its implications in their own situations. Perhaps this was a strength, for each person showed genuine concern as to how teachers of the culturally deprived might be best prepared.

Initially, the group tackled the problem of the prospective teacher himself. If feasible, this person should be identified as early as possible. Some felt that the senior level in high school was not too early a time although they recognized the changing interest patterns of the adolescent. Personality characteristics of the prospective teacher were considered most important, particularly some of those described by speakers at the session this afternoon; for example, love, honesty, dedication, awareness of the worth of the human being.

When college freshmen and sophomores are found who enjoy working with the culturally deprived, every effort should be made to sustain, develop, and nurture this interest so that these young people eventually become teachers. Colleges need to provide experiences that will foster this type of interest and keep these persons from being lost to the profession.

Several suggestions were made regarding ways of implementing the recommendations brought out in the foregoing. Within each suggestion the concept of involvement was paramount. To know more about the culturally deprived, prospective teachers need to gain all the information they can about community backgrounds and community resources. In this way, fears and suspicions can be allayed. Out of this can come a self-analyzing person who knows himself--his likes and dislikes, his strengths and weaknesses. He can then answer a most important question: "Should I work with the culturally deprived?"

The plea was made several times for more flexibility in college programs for the training of teachers. The value of tutorial approaches, small-group work, and larger-group teaching was emphasized. Laboratory experiences (including student teaching) of as many types as possible were deemed most desirable--experiences with children from the culturally deprived group, from the middle class, and from the upper class. At this point some embivalent feelings were manifested. Part of the group made a strong stand for flexibility while others wanted a highly structured situation. Basic purposes were found to be the same, however.

The topic of course work for prospective teachers was discussed briefly. For the most part, the group felt that current college courses had enough flexibility within them to allow for the kinds of professional experiences that seem tremendously important to the work of teaching the culturally deprived--experiences such as field work and firsthand contact with the life and structure of the community.

Attention was directed to the need for college professors to become better acquainted with problems of the culturally deprived and the responsibilities they have in this matter. The concept of the movement of teacher training in this special area to the "inner city" and using a "clinical professor" was accepted.

Legal requirements affecting teacher education came into the group discussion, as one would naturally expect.

At this stage, considerable emphasis was given to the place of the master teacher--the supervisor of the student teacher. Many felt that this person's role should be heightened but that monetary rewards should be increased proportionately so that individuals doing this kind of work would be encouraged to remain in the profession--particularly in the area of teaching the culturally deprived. This led to a review of the intern program and its tremendous potential.

Finally, while the group did not support a model program, the constant need for evaluation of teacher education was made strongly apparent. It is true that terms such as "commitment," "involvement," "communication," "teamwork," and the like are heard almost continually in these challenging times; but not one of them is without meaning. Rather, they reflect an honest, humanitarian concern to deal with possible solutions to complex problems. We do not have a model. But we do have some ideas which, hopefully, will yield a better citizen, whether he be "culturally deprived" or "culturally affluent," whether he be "disadvantaged" or "advantaged."

Group 10

Discussion Leader: Eva Washington, Sonoma State College, Rohnert Park
Resource Consultant: Jannett Hebbert, University of California, Berkeley
Recorder: John Devine, University of San Francisco

The theme of the group discussion was "The Impossible Quest"--the challenging, seemingly impossible objective of building a program that will train young men and women to become truly successful teachers of disadvantaged children. While the goal sometimes appears to be out of reach, the group felt that it is reachable if a realistic, workable program can be developed and ways can be found to sustain the program.

The following major points were identified and discussed:

A. Purpose of the program:

Produce successful teachers of the disadvantaged.

B. Desirable requirements of the candidate:

1. A sound liberal education.
2. Minimum expression of the desire to work with the culturally disadvantaged.
3. Field experiences early in his college career.

C. Rationale of a program:

1. Theory should be directly related to practice.
2. A genuine college-school partnership should be developed and sustained.
3. Extensive knowledge of the community is needed.
4. There should be a continuum of preservice and inservice training.
5. Remuneration should be made for field services rendered.
6. The program should be realistic.

D. Structure of the program:

1. Students should be placed as a group in a public school. The school should be regarded as a full-time learning center.
2. The director of instruction should do the following:
    a. Guide all learning experiences of new teachers.
    b. Evaluate the instructional program.
    c. Coordinate all resources of school, college, and community.
    d. Conduct tutorials, short-term seminars, independent study sessions.
    e. Organize, assign, provide, instructional materials.
    f. Serve as instructional aide to the total school faculty.
    g. Serve as a joint appointee of the college and the school district.

3. Actual experience in the program is a major ingredient. There should be a gradual induction leading to full teaching. The curve of experience would include that of tutor, of aide, of the teacher of one class.

   a. Six weeks--Aide

   b. Six weeks--teacher trainee

   c. Six weeks--half-day teacher

   d. Six months--full-time teacher

4. Further field experience should include the following:

   a. Practical, realistic application of educational psychology and educational sociology.

   b. The development of a personal philosophy of teaching.

5. The distirct accreditation board should have responsibility for the following:

   a. Assist in the appointment of a director.

   b. Evaluate the operation.

REPORT

# of the

THIRD GENERAL SESSION

REPORT OF THE THIRD GENERAL SESSION

Address of the Session

"School-College Cooperation: Implications for the Preparation of Teachers for the Culturally Deprived"

--Norman B. Scharer, Superintendent, Santa Barbara City Schools

Although we are hearing many things about many programs, certainly we are all agreed that the most important ingredient of any educational program is the teacher. But before I talk about teachers, it might be well for us to review briefly some of the dramatic events that are taking place in education today.

I believe we are moving so fast in some areas of education that we have lost our breath; some of us are out of stride, and I am including the man who is speaking to you. We have been startled by the speed with which federal aid programs have come into the field--Head Start, Title I, and the like. We are not used to such speed in education. We accept the fact that we can be jet-propelled to Chicago in about four hours. We accept the computer in industry. But we are still prone to think in horse-and-buggy ways as far as education is concerned.

We are not self-assured; we are not composed. We're bothered about change, we're bothered about innovation, and we're bothered about both. Obviously many changes and new developments are taking place in education. But what concerns us most is how to begin changes and how to keep them going. After we do get changes going, we don't know what to do with them. The administrators blame the teachers, the teachers blame the administrators, and probably some of us blame the colleges. Some boards of education, some superintendents, some universities, some teachers, and some citizens do not like changes. But my experience has been that usually the citizen is a step ahead of the educator as far as change and innovation are concerned. All this can be reduced to a simple denominator: we've got to recognize that we are in the midst of changing times. We are here--teaching and administering--and we must do something about what is happening.

One of these changes is very much involved with the teaching profession at the present time. This profession, so vital to the children and youth of our nation, is undergoing great internal change. At one time we were a submissive group, but now we have become combative. At one time we were classified as mice; now there are many teachers who have the drive and the vigor of lions. At one time teachers considered prayer; now they consider strikes and threats of strikes. The teaching profession has gained more respect because it has demanded respect. Moreover, I think it has been rather hard for some of us administrators to adjust to the fact that teachers are choosing us instead of the other way around--that superintendents and school boards are choosing them. In other words, teacher demand is greater than teacher supply.

Another significant change is that--in the judgment of many people--education has become a national enterprise. We spend about 33 billion dollars annually on education--state funds and federal funds. The state cannot supply everything that is needed, so the federal government has stepped in to help. The federal government has become a free-spending partner. I think that some of this money is being wasted. But we are reminded frequently that education is of national concern and that the whole national picture, including our political structure, is tied up very closely to education. Perhaps this tie is a bit tighter and more involved than I would like to observe it. Just let any vulnerable idea be discovered in our public schools today or even in our private schools, and along comes federal money. I'm talking about counseling programs, math programs, science programs, and so on. I am not sure this is right; I am not sure where all this will lead. Nevertheless, I think we can say that in most cases we are using this money to great advantage.

The college student, too, is changing today or has already changed. When we look back on our own college days, some of us recall that we took great pride in the fact that we worked while we were going to college. A number of students are doing the same thing now, but it is not so easy for them. At this time in our century there are so many great demands that are placed upon the college student. And great demands, too, are placed upon college teachers.

There is another change that is taking place, and this bothers some of us. The public is taking more of a hand in education. Sometimes we are forced into a corner, or we are forced into making a decision or establishing a critical policy because of some direct pressures or direct action--and I'm not so sure that this is right. But who is to blame for what? One of the reasons why we are having trouble with some of our parents and citizens today is that when some of us were in the classroom 25 and 30 years ago, we taught these very people--youngsters then--how to think and encouraged them to be creative; now perhaps we wish we hadn't done this. We have preached about public participation and yet we have given no directions. We have talked about public cooperation and then we squirm about it. We advocate the use of citizens' committees and then we get a little tired of too many citizens' committees. We have taught and taught about the principle of equal educational opportunity, and yet deep down we have known all along that a lot of young people were not being treated equally. One of the greatest problems we have been caught up in today is that of integration, and if you see what is happening in Alabama and elsewhere in the nation, you know that the thing is not settled yet. So we have many problems that involve us with the people--with the public; and perhaps these are inevitable, for we are teaching the people's children. But I believe what bothers me most is the fact that we are not doing enough solid thinking about our problems and our needs. Too many decisions are being made on the basis of emotions instead of facts.

Another change I want to identify is that some of our educational idols are being roughly handled and broken. I don't think it is particularly reassuring simply to pass this off by saying, "Well, out of this chaos good things will come" or "something better will result." Sometimes it is rather difficult for us who have been in administration over a period of years to recognize certain changes. But I believe we cannot afford to be blind to what is taking place. I believe, especially, that some of us here in California can no longer afford to be smug. A great community enterprise is going on in Flint. New educational centers are being built in New Jersey. Tremendous advances are being made in Florida. Even some of the big magazines are writing about innovations of this caliber. So we cannot afford to be smug.

In Santa Barbara the graded school is still sacred. I am not so sure it it should be. This year I have said to my elementary principals that when they discuss problems or consider new ideas, I don't want them to think first of obstacles. Let's worry about obstacles second. But it is hard to change this thinking. We are still talking about the self-contained classroom; maybe this is desirable, maybe it is not. We still have the formalism that education should begin in kindergarten at the age of four years, nine months. Some of us are clinging to the 6-3-3 plan when perhaps we should have a 4-4-4 plan. I could go on to interschool athletics, to grades, to I.Q. tests and other tests, and to a number of other things that may or may not be sacrosanct. Then there is teacher training. I think we have made a mistake in leaving this kind of training entirely to the professionals--and I speak as a public school man. It is not just the fault of the professionals. We have been invited to participate, and too often we have not accepted that invitation. What do I mean by all this? I mean that changes are here; changes are facing us, and too many of us cling to ways of doing things largely because we have followed those ways in the past, not so much because we are convinced they are still effective. Instead of meeting changes head on and giving leadership, we hide behind idols.

What are the implications of these changes I have been talking about? I really can't accept the notion that education is sick. I don't think we are having a breakdown at all. You remember that at a teachers' institute 20 years ago the topic was "Education at the Crossroads." Well, education has been at the crossroads every year that I have been with the schools. And it is going to be that way next year and the year after that. I believe that we have opportunities around us that we have never had before. Certainly we have difficulties at the present time, and I realize that we don't have quite the direction that we need. Yet I think we are learning something about master planning and direction. I have begun to feel that we do not have to develop a philosophy first and then seek all these other things afterward. I believe that you can develop a philosophy and master-plan for buildings and curriculum more or less on a broad front. In fact, I believe that is the only way it can be done. It is true that some of these problems and changes are not of our creation. But it is important to understand that we can use them and that we should not muff our chance to use them. Attitudes have changed; they are changing now; and they will continue to change. It is my belief that we in this room--members of public schools, members of universities, educators, and citizens--all of us must work together to use change well and to take advantage of it without fear. Change can mean progress. I feel that it must mean progress.

Tonight I am not going to try to establish a need for special training for teachers in impacted schools, in schools that have special problems. The need is already there. We know that these schools do have special problems and that they need to be staffed with special teachers--persons with special training, special references, special backgrounds. I think the universities recognize this need or you wouldn't be here and you wouldn't ask me to talk to you. And I think that we in the public schools are beginning to recognize this need. When I received my teaching credential, I thought I was qualified to teach at any grade level--any subject at any level. This kind of thing is just not done any more. The real question is: What can we do to meet this need? What can be done to meet it widely and effectively? How can we break the iron curtain of habit, fear of the untried, and resistance to change?

First of all, I believe we need to do some sound planning. I think there are two types of planning: one, to meet immediate needs; the other, to look toward long-range goals. Sometimes we can't just sit in the superintendent's office or at a conference table and ask, "What are we going to do with kids who need help in reading next year?" -- or next semester or even next month? Sometimes we have to take action immediately. Not more than five hours ago, one of my staff members came to me and said, "Norm, I have a problem. We have a youngster who just transferred in from San Francisco, and he isn't the right age to be in our first grade. If I let him enter the first grade, what's going to happen to him next year when he ought to be in the second grade?" I tried to smile; I tried to be kind. I said: "Let's consider the kid first, and when you find out what this kid needs, you place him where he ought to be placed and we will do anything--even break a policy--to take care of this youngster." And I turned on my heel and went to the office. I get so tired of people who think about rules, policies, and general situations first and the youngster second. This kind of fearful attitude so often makes individual boys and girls suffer. Perhaps I have deviated from my theme--but not actually. This planning that we have to do must take into consideration the real needs, the actual needs of the young people we seek to educate. And I also believe that this planning must be done jointly--I mean by the colleges and by those of us who use the products of the colleges.

Secondly, we need to be concerned with the characteristics that these special teachers should have. I have not used the word "traits." I have not used the word "personalities." And in my notes I have not used the words "teachers" or "credentials." I use the word people. And my subpoint is the characteristics of people. One of my favorite songs is Barbra Streisand's ballad about people: "People who need people are the luckiest people." I think there is a lot of good philosophy in that.

If these teachers--these people--are going to be working in specialty schools, what should they be like? What sort of training should they have? What kind of characteristics should they possess? One of the most important things they must have is the ability to communicate. Let me tell you something that actually happened. One of the best counselors that we ever had in Santa Barbara was working in a junior high school where he was able to take a boy by the shoulder and say, "Damn it, you've got to do better!" Later he went to another junior high school in the upper upper middle class. He did the same thing, and at once I was bombarded with phone calls. The counselor was accused of swearing at the kids.

We've got to know to communicate with these youngsters. For example, if they don't know anything about a cow, you can't start there. You know the philosophy of education in the elementary school: you start where the youngster is. And when we are talking about communication, I want to go a step farther than the pupil. How about the parents? How about the community? I am not saying that every teacher in a special school must learn to speak the language of the majority group in the community--for example, Spanish or the dialect of southern Negroes. I think this would help. But I do believe that many people have the ability to communicate even though they are not able to speak with one another.

I feel very keenly about trying to get the right type of teachers for these schools. I have been infected with this conviction only recently. It was not until two months ago that I wrote our director of personnel a letter concerning teacher characteristics. (I should have done this three years ago.) The letter went something like this: When you hire teachers for these schools (I listed the schools by name), let these three factors loom large in importance: (1) They must be able to communicate. It would be well if they could speak the Spanish language or at least understand it. (2) They should have some experience with poverty. I don't mean that they must have come out of poverty backgrounds; I mean they should have an understanding of poverty, that they know some of its very real problems. Then they will have a feeling for some of the things that the minority group has to cope with. (3) We should be concerned with ethnic balance. I think it is fairly obvious that ability to do the job should be the chief basis for hiring, not skin color. But we also need to bear in mind that hiring must always be done with fairness, never with prejudice. We must make every effort to see that trained people from minority groups are given equal hiring opportunity.

Another characteristic which I rank high on the list of attributes for these special teachers is a "social worker attitude." I am proud of the fact that I have an A.B. with a major in sociology and an M.A. in sociology. I know these studies have helped me. A "social worker attitude" means a number of things. Probably the most important is the ability to listen. In other words, talk less and listen more. Just listening to people voice their problems goes a long way toward finding solutions for those problems. Haven't you been in an elementary classroom where the teacher does all the talking? Certainly you have. I believe the social worker is concerned about the image a child has of himself; and I believe, by the same token, that teachers must create a decent self-image in a youngster before they can teach him anything or before he will want to learn.

I think a social worker attitude also includes this point: a recognition that the home frequently has a negative influence on the child rather than a positive influence. I feel that those of you who are working in the federal programs realize this, particularly in your Head Start program.

Still another characteristic that bears close attention is the teacher's belief in human capacities. I think we must never assume--we do not have the right to assume--that any youngster is incapable of learning. At this point I am going to take a crack at tests. I don't think we are using the right tests for some of these youngsters; and I suspect that we are giving too much credence to the tests we are using. I remember that when I was an elementary principal, I made individual interpretations out of group tests. In these days to do this kind of thing is considered a sin or a crime.

Teachers in these impacted schools must be interested in practice more than in theory. Just this week a girl started at Buena doing her practice teaching in homemaking. On the second night I received a call from her, and she was just bouncing. She had learned more in those two days than in some of the classes she had taken. She didn't say it that way, but she was very excited about the actual thing. I am certainly not saying that theory is unnecessary; but we do need to get out in the field and do some exploring and find out what is really going on.

I believe also that a teacher in this area of special work must have a compulsion to serve. There are still some missionaries in our teaching ranks, and I honor them for it. There are still some pioneers in our teaching ranks, and I honor them too. Unless a teacher is a pioneer or a missionary in spirit, it would be hard to communicate, to get rapport with youngsters who spit and swear and lie on the floor and scream and do these things that other social strata deplore. That person must want to teach and help children who are deprived.

If the universities and teacher training institutions can't give you what you need, let us join in the effort. If we don't shoulder this task jointly, someone outside of education is going to step in and do the job. I suggest that some of you go out into the field. Those of you who are deans of schools should make it possible for your staff personnel to get some field exploration.

We need also to look at course structure. I have already cited the value of sociology. Some teachers in the state are required to take a course in anthropology, and I think that is important. These two course areas are likely to bring about a much better understanding of groups, communities, individuals, customs, problems. And there may be other helpful courses. I believe we need to get away from the old course patterns. I don't mean that we should throw the baby out with the bath. If you say we ought to keep most of an old structure after careful study on your part, and if you say this with an open mind, without bias, I will go along with you.

When we talk about better understanding, I wonder how many teacher training institutions visit Watts or the San Francisco area to learn firsthand? How many try to get close to the heart of the matter?

A key factor in the training of teachers is supervision. How many of you are using public school personnel to supervise? How many of you have gone to your superintendents and said, "We would like to borrow your best elementary teacher for a semester or a year"? It can be done. It has been done. And you who are superintendents and school people--have you tried to work out the obstacles? Have you tried to solve your problems of supervision? I would like to note that some of the best supervision that has ever been done was accomplished by one of our staff members under the direct supervision of the university. We hope to continue this practice, and we recommend it to others.

I believe the universities ought to give consideration to the value of training teachers how to use teacher aides. In Santa Barbara we haven't pioneered the role of the teacher aide, but we do have several at each school. Nevertheless, we have a number of teachers who prefer not to have aides. I think this resistance is unfortunate. Teacher aides do have valid functions and can render a great deal of valuable assistance in the school plant.

There is another facet of teacher training that deserves more attention. I think the education departments and classes in our colleges and universities should train the prospective teacher--or make it a part of regular teacher training--how to start or how to plan a pilot project. The teacher candidate should be taught how to plan, how to get ideas down on paper, how to approach an administrator about a feasible project. If the plan is well devised and if the teacher feels it will bring good results, it would be very hard for the administrator to say no.

Teacher training should also assign much more prominence to public relations than it has in the past. Prospective teachers need to be trained how to work effectively with the public. I mentioned citizens' committees earlier. We cannot stand aloof from the public any longer even though the public is Mexican, American, or Negro, or literate or illiterate. These citizens take a great deal of pride in the schools, and they feel they have a right to know what is going on. I've had some experience in this matter. I've stood before a group of angry Mexican-Americans, many of them uneducated; but these people have feelings, they have ideas, they can react intelligently, and they can boo you down if they take issue with something they feel strongly about.

Let us consider another important item. When I was teaching a summer course in Eugene, Oregon, in 1947, I was asked this question and I didn't have an answer--I'm not even sure I have an answer tonight. "How does a new teacher with ideas, enthusiasm, ambition, and dreams deal with hostile colleagues?" Now, this is no joke. It is a serious situation. We have all seen this kind of thing, and something should be done about it. I would recommend that we all go back to our homes and our jobs and try our best to find ways of solving this problem--not next year or some time in the future, but now.

My last point--but by no means the least--is this: I believe that teacher training institutions need to work more closely with the public schools. We ought to ask for this kind of cooperation; we ought to welcome it. How or in what specifics this is to be done I am not sure. But those who do the planning in this area should strive for more school participation in the fifth year of training. Moreover, I believe the university should take more responsibility for the personnel it has trained; it should follow up these young people during the first two years of their teaching experience. And what about the responsibilities of superintendents and other administrators? What about the responsibilities of boards of education?

They, too, need to get closer to the serious business of teacher training and teacher follow-up and teacher support. I think that any of us here who don't understand the program ought to understand it and ought to try to help it.

If we are willing to understand the program, if we are willing to join hands and make it better, then we will have more and better teachers for these impacted schools we have been talking about.

I recently read in some book or other that superintendents should make teachers go to these target schools whether they want to or not. I don't agree at all, because the youngsters would be the victims of unwilling teachers. The ones who teach deprived children should want to teach them; and, as a natural correlative, we should give them all the support and backup they need.

There is one kind of support that we need to consider much more than we have since the beginning of these programs. We should allow these teachers enough time to get out into the homes. They need to get acquainted with the homes and the families and the family backgrounds of these children. I think this is extremely important.

In this grave enterprise of teaching the culturally deprived, the poor, the disadvantaged, there are so many things that need our attention. What about appropriate classroom space? What about equipment? What about class sizes, schedules, conference rooms, audio-visual aids, course coverage, teacher benefits? Have we done everything possible to make the special teacher's job easier? I don't think so. I do believe this: that every teacher has just so much energy to expend, just so much to give. We must give them the suppport they need even if we have to fight to get it. So what does the future hold? I will leave you with an answer to that question: If WE do not do our job, someone else will.

REPORT

# of the

FOURTH GENERAL SESSION

THE FOURTH GENERAL SESSION
(Capsule Summary)

Session Assignment:

Presentation and Discussion of Model Programs

The Fourth General Session of the CCET Spring Conference was held in the Miramar Room, April 1, from 8:30 a.m. to approximately 10:30 a.m. Dorothy Blackmore, member of the Board of Directors, presided.

This session was devoted to the presentation of "model programs" by the group chairmen and a discussion of these programs by student teachers and intern teachers under the sponsorship of several California colleges and universities.

The moderator for the discussion was Les Francis, representing the Student California Teachers Association.

The participating discussants were the following: Jannett Hebbert, University of California, Berkeley; Melvin Myler, California Western University, San Diego; Peggy Newgarten, California State College, Los Angeles; Robert Reynolds, San Francisco State College, San Francisco; and Mary Earl Spencer, University of California, Berkeley.

The presentations and the discussions concerning them made this one of the most interesting, most constructive phases of the conference. The dominant characteristic of the session, obviously, was earnestness. The young people who discussed the models showed that they want this vital work of helping the deprived and the disadvantaged to succeed, and that they want the preparation that is needed for it to be intensive enough and realistic enough to make this success possible.

Because of faulty recording, it was not possible to transcribe the details of this session. But no one who attended it will forget it.

REPORT

# of the

FIFTH GENERAL SESSION

REPORT OF THE FIFTH GENERAL SESSION

Address of the Session

"Analysis, Reactions, and Next Steps"

--Kenneth Osborn, Superintendent, Santa Maria Schools

I would like to share with you this morning the thoughts and reflections that have been forming during your conference. If I were to look inside of myself right now, I think I would see this cybernetic system of mine shooting sparks and shorting out. Why would this be? I would see this because I am confused, troubled, and frustrated. I feel anger, I feel sadness, I feel love, I feel futility. All of these feelings are ricocheting around inside me, and I hope that what I have to say to you will come out organized.

I have listened very attentively to your tapes, some of them many times. I am sure that there is no part of education that is more important than teacher training; and I am almost as sure that there is no part of education that we bungle so badly.

During the past four weeks I have been in and out of California, interviewing prospective teachers. As I talked to these youngsters--they're not all quite as sharp as the group you selected this morning, I assure you--I saw a parallel between the affluent Romans and the Christians, on the one hand, and the affluent educators and the trainees, on the other. I think that we administrators who assign these young teachers and you people who train them literally throw them to the lions. Yesterday a gentleman told me that in a school of 44 teachers, after four years' time, only two were left. That is a shame! So this is my anger and my sadness as I have reviewed your conference--to realize that a job that is so critical is done so badly. My frustration, my feeling of futility, is that I don't know what to do about it. I don't know where to start, what to say, how to change it. But God knows it must be changed.

The love I feel is for the young people who have come here. I was particularly taken by the panel you had yesterday. If Mrs. Baldinger is here now, I would like to say to her, "if you want a job, please come to Santa Maria." We like rabble-rousers who are fine beautiful people, and I think you are.

It seems to me that the conference has come forth with many excellent ideas, many pertinent suggestions, some very insightful and meaningful comments. I will cite some of these only briefly because I should not be reviewing what the reviewers have already done.

The first point--an obvious one-- is that education is in turmoil. We have militant teachers, militant kids, and militant parents. The legislators are having a football game with us,, and we are the ball.

Moreover, we are experiencing a complete lack of faith and confidence in our communities. A school board member said to me not long ago: "The trouble with you professional educators is that you can't see the forest for the trees. You need practical people like us to tell you how to do it." Education is a hectic business, particularly at the administrative level. I say that because I am at that level. And by the same token, you think it's hectic at the teacher training level because that is where you are. A good friend of mine asked me recently, "how do you put up with this? You take guff from everybody" The only answer I could give him was that I cry a lot, literally and figuratively.

Education has money problems. I don't know how you solve these problems any more than I know how you handle the turmoil. There is something else which I think is quite serious--it was not mentioned during the conference--and that is the press problem. I hope there are no members of the press here. A classic example happened recently in San Francisco. There was some turmoil in a school where a teacher had apparently inferred certain things about the future of these young people. This made the headlines in the Chronicle for days and days and days. I am not closely acquainted with the San Francisco school system, but I do know that there are some fascinating and wonderful things going on in that system, and these things never get in the papers. I believe that's our real problem--how to give public recognition to the good work, the hard work that our teachers are doing.

We have all experienced the old shopworn illusions regarding reward and punishment. We have our societal reward-and-punishment system, our materialistic reward-and-punishment system. And you in higher education have your own reward-and-punishment system, which, as I understand it, is a great impedance to education.

Some day I'm going to make a statistical study. My hypothesis is that for every 1,000 people trained in secondary education, 999 of them do not want a junior high school. But if they can't get a job, they take a junior high vacancy until they can move on to a senior high. One of the panelists yesterday remarked--and it is so true--that if a teacher doesn't want to be in a certain class, the kids know it. Now, what a ludicrous system for our junior highs--a bunch of teachers who don't want to be there, and the kids know it! And of course there is the other reward-and-punishment system: Pick your school system if you can, assume that you will get a bad start, but keep your nose clean and do a good job and you'll eventually get to a good school. I don't know how you beat that one!

I was pleased to hear that you have a semantics problem--the culturally disadvantaged, the culturally different, the culturally deprived, the poor. I was quite taken with the comment about a certain town that is "fur-lined." In my experience as a teacher I have known many upper-class youngsters who were deprived--culturally deprived, love-deprived, all kinds of deprived. Therefore I would tend to agree with those people who have observed that our problem isn't the Mexican or the Negro. Our problem is all kids because they all have problems--perhaps some more than others, some different from others. I believe that numerous children are deprived of many things, not just economic things.

I noted that there was some reference to teaching materials, to dishonest curriculum, to lack of subgroups in history and literature; and I would agree that these areas are getting more attention than they did in the past. There was discussion about administrative inflexibility, and I frankly don't know what is to be done about that one--it is really a touchy problem. The panel that preceded me this morning referred to us administrators as inflexible and as lacking the spirit of adventure. I think this is so true! The panelists also alluded to tenure, which I feel I don't really have as an administrator--and yet that's part of the system too. I believe you have two alternatives: Either play the system and grow nice solid conventional roots, or be adventuresome and keep your suitcase packed.

These young people also mentioned communication problems, and these are major. I'm talking about communications between teachers and youngsters, between teachers and teachers, between school people and the community. They brought up the great need for the new young teachers coming fresh into the profession to get out into the field, to know the different cultures and subcultures in a real way. I think this idea is excellent; I think it is great. Get these young leaders-to-be into the community, into these cultures we are so concerned about.

The panelists also talked about sensitivity--about being sensitive to the needs of the young; this, in my judgement, is a very important part of the whole program. They talked about the joint responsibility which we administrators and you people have in preservice and inservice training.

I believe this factor of joint responsibility is critical, and I have thought a great deal about it. I'm sold on intern programs, for one thing. We've got to find a way to get more people into the schools for longer periods of time. I believe that the intern program, wherein you take a four-year person and put him out in the schools with a full teaching load, is a disgrace. As I look at it, this is simply a good way to get a cheap teacher. And I don't think these teachers have any time to learn anything. They just run all year long. That is not the way you learn; you have to stop once in awhile and think and meditate. If you are going to find out how a school works, you've simply got to have time to go and study and observe different parts of that school. If you are going to find out what the pupils are like, you've simply got to have the time to get to know them--to spend some time with them. Now, this is a problem we must solve. You can't do this when you are teaching full time.

This morning we heard the reports about the models that we are going to use to revolutionize the training of teachers for the culturally disadvantaged. We talked about the same kinds of things--flexibility, screening, communications between the public schools and the colleges. These are certainly important. My honest reaction, I think, was emotional. I was upset. Why? Because I realized only too well how badly these needs must be met.

I like Dwight Allen's comment about sewing shirts on buttons. I believe it is high time we put an end to our antiseptic, sterile, ivorytowerish attitudes. If we are going to change anything, we have to do it at the gut level; we cannot change it from afar. If we expect to make any progress, we have to get with it and in it. If we don't use this natural approach, we will run the risk of training ineffective people. We'll be training teachers who will be very maternalistic to very paternalistic with the culturally disadvantaged--one or the other. We'll train them to be do-gooders; and that is not teaching.

As an administrator, one of the frustrations I have had to put up with is being far away from the kids. I like kids. I like their jargon, I like their music. You know, I learned a new word yesterday: WASP. White, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant. If we don't do something at the gut level, then what are we training these kids for? A WASP culture? Do we know what education really means, and for whom it is meant?

If I were to hope for changes in teacher training, I would hope for three things especially: (1) More time in the schools--closer relationship between the schools and the recipients; (2) more cooperative action; and (3) sensitivity training.

My third point--sensitivity training--is something that has been mentioned several times during this conference. In my judgment this is the most important kind of training we can promote. If I could take just one trick out of the bag and place it above all others in my system, that would be sensitivity training. As a Wasp myself, I've always taken pride in Wasp value. I have always felt I had a lot of integrity, a lot of honesty, a lot of feeling for people. You know the jargon, because that's what wasps train other Wasps to do. Well, we've had an interesting three years in our district. We've had an intensified sensitivity training program for a small group of people--some administrators and some teachers--and the changes that we have seen in ourselves and in these teachers is utterly fantastic. To us who have had this experience, we think this may not be the whole answer. But it is such an important part of the answer that we just don't understand why everbody else doesn't see it. Perhaps we were naive in the first place, but I don't think so because we have had some sophisticated people involved in this program. The changes have been unbelievable. I have been in the classes of these teachers before and afterward, and I can recognize the difference in the way they teach culturally different youngsters. The difference is tremendous.

One of my greatest frustrations is the State Department of Education's policies regarding our great ESEA bill. Nearly everbody got their programs approved in September, October, and November. But our proposal was not approved until March because our program was primarily inservice education and the guidelines of ESEA dictate direct services to kids, and inservice training, according to the State Department of Education, does not constitute direct services to kids. I talked with Department personnel. They told me, "Mr. Osborn, you have a great program, and we agree--in terms of lasting effect on the young--that what you are doing is one of the best things we have seen. But it doesn't meet the guidelines. It isn't direct service."

Last Thursday night our Board, in seeking to solve its financial problems, came to a crossroads. It decided that in the next school year the financial reserves of the school district would be totally depleted. That is catastrophic, to say the least. But in spite of it, and in spite of the fact that the State Department won't help us, we are so convinced about the worth and the value of sensitivity training that we are going to find the money somewhere to carry it on.

Mrs. Baldinger's comments were particularly meaningful to me. She pointed out that what teachers of the culturally disadvantaged must give are honesty and love--and I cannot think of anything more important for any teacher to give. She said, and I know she is right: "If you can love these kids and listen to these kids. you can find out what they are that you never were; if you can love these kids and listen to these kids, you can find out where they are that you had a hard time getting to." And she also said: "If you can love these kids and respect these kids--respect the kid as he is, where he is, rather than what or where he might be--if you can do that, then maybe someday he can respect himself; maybe he'll come to think of himself as worthwhile; and maybe someday he'll say, 'somebody will hear me.'"

In Saroyan's play, The Cave Dwellers, a prize fighter kills an opponent, and this fact preys and preys on his mind. He tries to communicate, but nobody listens to him. He keeps trying, but people turn deaf ears to him. He becomes desperate. "Won't somebody help me? Please, won't somebody help me?" he cries. And then he screams "HELP!" As I look at these culturally disadvantaged youngsters, I can't help but feel that this is exactly what they are saying. "Won't somebody help me?" Nobody hears them; nobody sees them. Frank Lindsay did a beautiful job several years ago in his article on the "invisible student." You ought to read it. These kids are invisible. As teachers, as Wasps, we have a great case of Asian blindness. We don't "see" it, and I think the only way we're going to get hold of it and see it is to become sensitive. That is an easy thing to do, actually; but I repeat again that you cannot do it by talking about it. You simply have to get in it and with it at the gut level.

In closing, let me share something with you. On my flight from Phoenix last night, I noticed a cartoon in the Phoenix paper I was reading. This was a Peanuts kind of thing which I believe had a real message in it. I will modify it slightly to make it appropriate. A little girl and a little boy stood talking together. The little boy said, "Wouldn't it be wonderful if all the bad people were good?" And the little boy said, "Wouldn't it be wonderful if all the good people were nice?"

MINUTES

# of the

BUSINESS MEETING

MINUTES OF THE BUSINESS MEETING

Saturday, April 1, 1967

The Business Meeting of the CCET Spring Conference was an extension of the Fifth General Session held Saturday morning. James C. Stone, President of the Council, chaired the meeting.

Opening of the Meeting

President Stone:

I would like to acknowledge the fine efforts of those people who have made this council conference one of the most stimulating experiences we have ever known.

One item on the agenda concerns the position of Secretary-Treasurer. To put this in a setting, may I make a few comments? This council grew out of the World War II crisis of a shortage of teachers. Meetings were held in 1945 at Stanford University, where college and school personnel discussed this problem and worried and fretted over it. From those meetings came the formal organization in 1946 that we know today as the California Council on the Education of Teachers.

You must accept my apology if I become personal at this point, because I cannot talk about this without being personal. In 1949 you elected me Secretary of the Council, and you re-elected me in 1950. In 1951 you changed your constitution to provide that the secretary should be nominated by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and elected by the Council on a more or less permanent basis. It is important to note that at that time the Division of State Colleges and Teacher Education was the unit in the State Department of Education in which your secretary was housed. This was the operating division for the system of California State colleges and for the services of teacher education and certification. The Associate Superintendent, who was chief of that division, was also the chief administrative officer for the state college system, whose primary function by law was the education of teachers.

When Arnold Joyal was president of the Council in 1954, as well as President of Fresno State College, he initiated a contract with the State Department of Education which was approved the the Superintendent of Public Instruction, then Roy Simpson. This contract provided for an exchange of services from the State Department of Education with the Council and referred to the Council as the creature of the Department of Education. In 1956 the State Superintendent of Public Instruction nominated Carl Larson to serve as secretary of this Council, and he has continued to serve in that capacity with distinction ever since.

In 1960 the Legislature passed the Donahoe Act, which affected the entire public structure of higher education. Two phases of that far-reaching master plan has implications for our discussion this morning.

First of all, it took the system of state colleges out of the State Department of Education and placed it under a separate board of trustees in an arrangement similar to that which the University enjoyed under its Board of Regents, with no more relationship with the State Department of Education than the Board of Regents had. Secondly, the act provided that the state colleges were to be general arts and occupational education institutions offering bachelors' and masters' degrees and provided, further, that teacher education was to be but one of several functions of the state colleges. Under this act teacher education was to be no more important in those institutions than it was defined to be important in the State University.

In 1962 Max Rafferty was elected State Superintendent of Public Instruction and took office in January, 1963, thus ending the long term of service held by Roy Simpson. The President of the Council at that time, Glenn Kendall, arranged a conference with Dr. Rafferty and secured an oral agreement from him that the Superintendent would continue the secretarial services that had been provided traditionally under the previous State Superintendent. Formerly our constitution stated that our first function was to serve as an advisory body to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. In 1964 the Council revised its constitution to indicate that we would be advisory to all groups and agencies, including ourselves--one no more or less than the other. Thus, in effect, the contractual relationship that Arnold Joyal had established was nullified.

Beginning in 1965, when you elected me as President of the Council, we received questions raised in Sacramento regarding the historic relationship between the State Department and the Council, as well as the provision of services to the Council. Therefore, as your elected board, we began to bring about some decentralization of the function that had traditionally been carried by the lone secretary-treasurer. I will not go into the details of this unless you ask me; but we also appointed at that time a committee to look to the day when it might become necessary to have a permanent secretary-treasurer not provided by the State Department of Education. That Committee has been working on its assignment and will make a full report to your Board of Directors at its next meeting.

On August 30, 1966, it was my privilege to meet in Sacramento with Superintendent Max Rafferty and with Paul Lawrence, Chief of the Division of Higher Education and also a consultant to our Board of Directors, to discuss the future of this relationship of ours. Dr. Rafferty assured me at this time that the services would be provided through our Fall 1966 Conference at Yosemite and that any further decision must await the outcome of the election slated for the fall and also the tenor of the Legislature. On January 12, 1967, we held a board meeting and discussed the matter. We faced it realistically in all its implications.

During the afternoon of that board meeting, Carl Larson received from Paul Lawrence a telephone call which Dr. Larson reported to us at our meeting. Essentially the message said that because of the Governor's policy of trims, cuts, and squeezes, it would no longer be possible for the State Department of Education to provide these services after June 30th of this year, and we made this announcement to you in our February newsletter. Since that time there have been many discussions by numerous members of this group, by numerous other groups who have our interest at hear, and by Dr. Lawrence, Dr. Rafferty, and Dr. Calvert. It is now my pleasure and privilege to introduce to you Dr. Paul Lawrence, who wishes to make a statement on behalf of Dr. Rafferty in regard to this matter and to bring us up-to-date as to where we stand.

Statement by Dr. Lawrence

You all look so solemn that I can't help remembering the time many years ago when Winston Churchill was called to get the British Empire in line for coping with the generation which they were in--which, in effect, meant that the old British Empire, as many had known it, was going to be a new commonwealth. I suspect that at that historic moment, all the people who sat and waited for him to speak were just as serious as you are now. Although my father was born and reared as an English citizen, I can't for the life of me enunciate in the manner of the English. But I'm sure that you can imagine Churchill looking around at his solemn colleagues and saying: "I am not here to preside at the dissolution of Her Majesty's Empire." Nor am I here this morning to talk about the ending of Cal Council as you have known it; rather, to talk about Cal Council as it will be in the years ahead.

During the past 12 months numerous question have been raised, and comments made, regarding the State Department's continued interest and concern regarding the activities of the California Council on the Education of Teachers. All of the questions deserve answers. Many of the comments have been made by those not fully informed or advised or advised about the Council's functioning and the State Department's interest in its continuing functioning.

It is hoped that the statement I am about to make will help clarify matters so that the work of the Council can go on with far less uncertainty than has been apparent recently.

Everyone in the State Department has been fully aware and appreciative of the services rendered by Cal Council since its inception. The entire program of the State has been benefited, and there is every reason to hope that the State will continue to reap benefits through the associations made through Cal Council. As many of you know, and as you heard Jim say this morning, the original purpose of the Council was to serve as an advisory body to the State Department of Education in matters relating specifically to the improvement of teacher education in California. This was of particular significance to the Department of Education because the teacher training institutions providing the largest number of teacher candidates in California were the state colleges, which at that time were part of the State Department of Education.

During that period every act of the Cal Council made it possible for the Department to evaluate and, where necessary, modify and improve its teacher training programs. Every general meeting of the Council and special in-between sessions served to broaden that general purpose, thereby adding even greater benefits to teacher education in this State. There is no doubt that there were achieved varying degrees of success for which we are all grateful today.

However, it is to be noted that at the same time the broadening of purposes occurred, there was a noticeable change in the advisory function of the Council to the Department. By 1964 the advisory function had been changed to a liaison function with the Superintendent's Office, as is indicated in the constitution which was adopted at that time.

The new constitution contains an appropriate restatement of purposes of the California Council on the Education of Teachers because the role of the State Department of Education in the area of teacher education has changed materially. The state colleges, which are still the greatest California source of teachers, have been removed from the purview of the State Department of Education and the State Board of Education. These two agencies are now left with two responsibilities in teacher education-one, the accreditation or approval of teacher education programs, and the other, the certification of professional school employees. In the first instance, the accreditation of teacher education programs is a specific responsibility of the State Board of Education's Accreditation Committee, some of whom, incidentally, are members of the Council.

The second the certification process, has been and is becoming even more a set of procedural activities to carry out Legislative and Board mandates, even though under present circumstances there still is a great deal of confusion and delay in effecting proper certification.

In many professional areas, such as research, the calling of conferences, the development of educational statistics relating to teacher supply and demand, the credential structure, and the like, Cal Council has taken over a role that was once completely in the hands of the Department. It is most important to remember that with the adoption of the new constitution, the California Council on the Education of Teachers became of age as a full-fledged independent professional organization no longer needing to rely upon the State Department of Education to justify its existence or to support it in any way. Cal Council has rightfully taken its place among other state organizations, such as CASA, SJCA, and similar groups, and is entitled to the same services and recognition from the State Department as these groups have. Some of them are:

1. The calling of statewide conferences by the Superintendent at your wish
2. The assistance in the preparation and distribution of annual conference programs
3. The utilization of professional staff resources for planning and related services.

Before 1960, support was provided for Cal Council because it was necessarily a part of the Department's function. With this purpose now established as a minor role, the Council's priority for receiving departmental secretarial services cannot be justified to the extent that was once considered necessary. This does not affect our belief that Cal Council should have secretarial support consistent and commensurate with the established purposes of the Council, and the Department believes that the Council should take appropriate steps to provide this service as do other similar organizations.

The California Council on the Education of Teachers has rendered valuable and deeply appreciated services to education. The Department believes that the Council provides an opportunity for unity in the field of teacher education and is the one place where the efforts of all who consider teacher education important can be coordinated. We believe, too, that other interested organizations which are part of the Cal Council should support the activities of the Council if the Council is to continue serving California.

The State Department of Education intends to give positive support to the continuance of the Council. We will provide such delegate services as the constitution permits. We will continue to provide consultant services if the Council desires. We will have to urge that all participating organizations in the Council share the responsibility for providing Council services as may be required. The Department, as a participating member of the Council, will share equally with others in this venture. I am certain that no organization which considers the Council important would want us to do any less. Similarly, we expect that other organizations will take the same degree of responsibility.

This, then, is the official and the final statement of the Department as far as its relationships with Cal Council is concerned. I should close at this point, but I just want to take another moment to tell you how I think many of you feel.

Those of you who have daughters who have gone down the aisle to be married--you men in particular--know the feeling that you have when you see the groom coming toward you. You know that he isn't going to do half as well by that little girl as you have done. And when they say "I do," you have to step aside. You have a sinking feeling, but you also know inwardly that it is not all over--that actually something better is going to come out of it for all concerned. And for Lou and Margaret and Carl and Blair and Eli--I sense the feelings that you have because I've worked with you long enough to know the warm affection that you have for Cal Council. We in the Department may be stepping aside, relinquishing a major part of Council affairs, but we know too that even bigger and better things are coming. Thank you.

Comments and Discussions

President Stone:

Thank you, Paul, for your forthright statement, made in such an articulate manner. At its meeting a few days ago, your board had

6

anticipated that this statefment would be made. In regard to our future, we looked at all the alternatives. Let me review them briefly for you:

We can quit and give up. We can protest some more. We can seek a grant so that somebody else can carry the load--instead of dipping down into our jeans. We can affiliate with some other agency now that the State Department will be unable to be a direct affiliate. We can raise new revenues and reorganize as necessary in order to go forward.

In looking at these proposals, your board has agreed as follows: Number one is ridiculous. Number two has run its course. About Number three: we did seek a grant, and we received word yesterday from the Rosenberg Foundation that the grant we had requested is not forthcoming. The foundation said, in effect: "You're asking for a one-year basis of support, and yet you've provided us with no plan whereby at the end of that year you would be self-supporting and ongoing." So for the moment they have said "no" until we can provide them with this kind of assurance. Regarding affiliation--we have looked at this and have rejected it also.

Therefore, our proposal to you as a council is that you authorize your board between now and the Yosemite conference to use your ideas and whatever ideas we can come up with, as a foundation for a specific plan with proposals for new revenues and for whatever reorganization is appropriate. We would hope that at the Yosemite conference a specific plan with proposals for new revenues and for whatever reorganization is appropriate. We would hope that at the Yosemite conference a specific plan of operation for the future will be presented and acted upon--a plan that will guarantee the California Council on the Education of Teachers a frame of independence and a voice far stronger, far more sure than any voice we've had in cur past 20 years. Do you have questions or comments? Sister.

(Sister Rosemarie Julie, who heads teacher education at the College of Notre Dame, Belmont, raised a question from the floor.)

President Stone:

Carl, would you care to make a statement?

Statement by Dr. Larson

First I want to talk with you personally, not as a member of the State Department of Education, but as a long term member of the Council. The position of the Department has been made clear. It will be supported. While I do not agree with the Department in the decision that has been made, I must say that I am not looking at it from a total Department of Education standpoint. I am only looking at it from the limited viewpoint of the Bureau of Teacher Education and Certification. From my own personal standpoint we received great value from our participation. Yes, far greater value than we gave.

The decision the Department has made is logical and is well taken. Though I wish the decision had been different, it has been made, and we who are members of the staff of the Department of Education accept the decision graciously. We hope to continue participating in the Council in the future as outlined by Dr. Lawrence. Rather than to take a negative view the Council should think positively. Perhaps something has happened that is good for us; that it's a new day; that the Council has a new mission. We all know change is inevitable, and while it is natural to hold to what we have, we cannot always do so. All things change. The Council now faces a period change--hopefully for the better.

Whatever success we have had as your staff, Margaret and Lou have been outstanding in the service they've given and in their loyalty to the Council. While I am your secretary, that's really but a name. Margaret started with the Council in 1950, and has been "Miss California Council" ever since. Lou was on the job when I became your secretary in 1956. Both of these girls have been literally towers of strength. We three have appreciated the many kindnesses that you've shown us. We thank you for the cooperation we've gotten, the warmth that we feel. I well remember that night in Yosemite when I was elected as secretary. When Burt Vasche presented me to the Council I kept thinking to myself "They don't know me. What if they don't want me, what can they do? They can't do anything. It's all set up." I got over those thoughts rather quickly following the sincerely warn reception I got. Being your secretary has been tremendous. It has really made my job.

Margaret, Lou, and I have volunteered to do one thing (not as Department staff members, not on Department time, and this must be crystal clear), to help the Council get through the period of transition from now to the change that will come. The Council must get ready for Yosemite next fall. Board of Directors meetings must be held. Minutes must be written, letters must be sent. A multitude of details must be attended to. Anything we do for the Council after June 30, 1967, must be over and above and beyond our State jobs. We have volunteered to do this to the best of our ability because the job needs to be done. The Council cannot buy the "know-how" of Margaret and Lou. Someday someone else must develop that know-how, but it cannot be done overnight.

Now may an old "ex-secretary" offer a bit of advice. Let's look to a bigger and a better and a stronger Council. I hope your past relationships with the Department of Education have all been cordial and that the Department has never dictated to you during the time that either Jim or I served as your secretary. I sincerely hope that during these years the Council has not only felt independent but has been independent.

Let's look to the future with confidence. Let's avoid entangling alliances whenever we can. Cal Council has been great in the past. It will continue its greatness in the future. We have been proud to serve you. We have received more than we have given.

Further Comments and Actions Taken

President Stone:

The chair would entertain a motion from the floor.

Motion from the floor:

I would move that the board of directors be authorized to proceed with planning for the establishment of the California Council on the Education of Teachers as an independent organization with adequate financing and individual intergrity.

President Stone:

Is there a second?

(The motion was seconded.)

President Stone:

The motion has been made and seconded. Is there discussion? Sister.

Sister Rosemarie Julie:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a few more personal comments to the number that have been made so well this morning. I speak as a person who served on the reorganization of the Council's constitution, and as one who has served on the Council's Board of Directors. I can point to no other group in California that has made a more significant contribution toward unification of the interests of teacher education in this State than the California Council. As you well know, during the lifetime of the Council this State has become the largest in the Union populationwise. Also during the Council's existence, the number of colleges preparing teachers in California has more than doubled.

I would like to turn this question around and see whether, in an innovative fashion, we might use it from its most constructive angle. I would like to ask Dr. Lawrence: What is the greatest possible service that can be given to us, to those of us who are preparing teachers for the future of this State? And, at the time of California's enormous growth, what is the greatest possible service that can be rendered by the State Department of Education? I would ask that such service be considered most seriously, for the need is very great. You listened to the young people this morning tell us of many things. We want to do these things, but we need help. We need twice as much help today as we needed in 1945. I would hope that this kind of support and assistance can be given to us by the State Department of Education, the one department which now bears the responsibility for teacher education throughout the State.

The other institutions in the State are also doing their share in adding a fullness to the program that would not otherwise be apparent. Therefore I am confident that we will receive the help and support we need to accompish the many more things that are yet to be done.

In the deliberations and discussions about our future, we must not forget the unique characteristics of Dr. Carl Larson and the valuable services he has performed for so many years. To echo his own words, it is one thing to talk about being a secretary, but it is another thing to be one. I know you will agree with me when I say with conviction that you don't often find men with the integrity, the knowledge, the confidence, and the generosity that this man has. We are not willing to relinquish this kind of service, and I don't think we need to. I would re-emphasize my hope that the Council will be able to realize even more help from Dr. Larson than in the past--but I would also hope that this would not have to be done at eleven o'clock at night and on his own time!

Therefore, Dr. Lawrence, I would ask you to relay this information, these observations, these requests to Dr. Rafferty, whose integrity has made so good an impre-sion on us in the field. We would ask the Superintendent to give his most serious attention and consideration to this request for continued guidance, support, and service. Thank you.

President Stone:

Any other comments? Is there a call for the question? Presenting the question to you, I would like to offer my interpretation of it. Briefly, it is this: When you act on this question, you are considering as final and irrevocable the statement that Dr. Lawrence made to us today that the services we have enjoyed in the past will end on June 30th of this year. And the motion that has just been made is that your board of directors be authorized, in view of this decision, to make whatever plans may be necessary for refinancing and reorganization, as the board deems appropriate, and to present to you at Yosemite full plans for your total consideration and action.

(Question from the floor.)

President Stone:

Paul, you may wish to answer that. I assume this is a decision that has been made with a good deal of thought.

Dr. Lawrence:

I am afraid this is it. Let me give you a parallel of something that occurred last year. Somehow the people who control the purse strings found out that the Department was giving service on accreditation teams. We were asked: How much time is taken up in this kind of service? And we said, openly and honestly: It takes approximately three and one-tenth man-days a year to get this job done, and we think it is a very important job. The people who control the purse strings said, in essence: What you are saying is that you use the time equivalent to three and one-tenth persons. We said, yes. They said: Fine; this is none of your business; therefore, not only will you not get the additional persons you have requested, but we will take away from your staff three and one-tenth persons. You will not do that work any more.

Therefore I would say this: If Carl and his cohorts--his colleagues who have worked so long and honestly for so long a period of time--can find a way to tide you over until something better can be developed, then, in my opinion, this effort would be the more desirable path to pursue. To do anything else would make it quite impossible for us to do as much as we have done in the past, and I would agree with you that twice as much needs to be done in the future.

The fact of life is that the present time is not the opportune hour to do many of the things that we felt were important when we were not authized to do them. It has been made clear to us that this is not an authorized activity. The best route to follow is to make the break. You will recall that I stated that the Department of Education intends to become a participating member just as any other organization might be. This means that the degree of service that we give will be the same as that which any other organization will give to the Council. The degree of support will be our responsibility.

The five people I mentioned earlier I have known long enough to understand that they are not going to pull out because they can't make it legally or financially. They will be with you. I'm not their boss; I'm their colleague. But if it is necessary to make some little arrangements to get some things done, I believe this can be brought about. Officially, however, I have given you the Department's position. Mr. Chairman, I think you had better go ahead with your vote. Thank you.

President Stone:

I hear a call for the question. All those in favor of the motion authorizing your board to move forward on the assumption that the services of the State Department of Education are ended and that we should come up with a new plan for refinancing and reorganization--this plan to be reported to you for full discussion at the meeting in Yosemite--signify by saying "aye." Opposed? Motion is carried.

To conclude, let me tell you that one of our talented young girls said something to us this morning about being dedicated but not allied. I think the Council should go forward both dedicated and allied.

ROSTER

ROSTER

Adams, Glen W.,	Azusa Pacific College, Azusa
Aigner, Henry	Dominican College, San Rafael
Allen, Dwight	Stanford University, Stanford
Bachtold, Louise M.	University of California, Davis
Ballentine, Frances	San Diego State College, San Diego
Ballou, Stephen V.	California College & University Faculty Association, Fresno
Barbee, Donald L.	San Francisco State College, San Francisco
Barnett, Earl B.	Los Angeles City Schools, Los Angeles
Beery, Cleo C.	La Verne College, La Verne
Berry, Aubrey L.	University of California, Berkeley
Black, Hugh C.	University of California, Davis
Blackmore, Dorothy	University of California, Davis
Bolton, Donald	Los Angeles City Schools, Los Angeles
Bradley, Jack	California Mathematics Council, Visalia
Brady, Elizabeth	San Fernando Valley State College, Northridge
Brown, Gerald W.	California State College, Hayward
Brown, Hubert O.	Saint Mary's College, St. Mary's College
Burchill, George W.	University of Redlands, Redlands
Burnett, Lewie	California State College, Hayward
Cavenagh, Jane T.	California Junior College Association, Los Angeles
Clague, W. Donald	La Verne College, La Verne
Cole, James C.	Stanislaus State College, Turlock
Crawford, Maurice	San Diego State College, San Diego
Crum, Clyde E.	San Diego State College, San Diego
Cusick, James	California State College, Fullerton
Devine, John R.	University of San Francisco, San Francisco
Dickason, O. H.	Los Angeles City Schools, Los Angeles
Dickison, Lucille	California Congress of Parents and Teachers, Inc., Los Angeles
Doane, Kenneth	California State College, Fullerton
Dolcini, Mary Ellen	California Teachers Association, Davis
Edwards, Russell	Monterey Institute of Foreign Studies, Monterey
Elliott, Marion A.	Los Angeles City Schools, Los Angeles
Erlandson, Theodore	Loyola University, Los Angeles
Evans, Mary	Stanford University, Stanford
Farley, Artelle	Dominican College, San Rafael
Farmer, Jr., Greene	Operation Fair Chance, California State College, Hayward
Field, Earle	San Fernando Valley State College, Northridge

Finnegan, Father Darrell, F. X.	Loyola University, Los Angeles
Fisk, Robert G.	California State College, San Bernardino
Formhals, Robert W.	California School Boards Association, Sacramento
Francis, Les	Student, California Teachers Association, Burlingame
French, John E.	San Jose State College, San Jose
Fordsham, Olaf M.	Occidental College, Los Angeles
Garrity, Rodman	California State Polytechnic College, Pomona
Glenn, William H.	California Association of School Personnel Administrators, Pasadena
Graham, Gloria S.	California State College, Los Angeles
Gumeson, George S.	California Teachers Association, Aptos
Hamilton, Charles E.	California Teachers Association, Burlingame
Hammerman, Bill	San Francisco State College, San Francisco
Harney, Rev. Paul J.	University of San Francisco, San Francisco
Henderson, Braxton	California State College, Long Beach
Hendrick, Irving G.	University of California, Riverside
Hieronymus, Frank L.	Westmont College, Santa Barbara
House, Robert	San Francisco State College, San Francisco
Hurd, Blair E.	State Department of Education, Sacramento
Hurst, Homer	Whittier College, Whittier
Jensen, Henry	California Association of Secondary School Administrators, San Jose
Jones, Dick	Biola College, La Mirada
Jones, L. L.	California Association of School Administrators, Ventura
Jung, Raymond K.	San Fernando Valley State College, Northridge
Kilman, Marvin	California Baptist College, Riverside
Larson, Carl A.	State Department of Education, Sacramento
Lawrence, John D.	Sonoma State College, Rohnert Park
Lawrence, Paul	State Department of Education, Sacramento
Leland, Allen	California Luthern College, Thousand Oaks
Leslie, Larry L.	University of California, Berkeley
Lien, Norman S.	California Association of County Superintendents of Schools, Santa Cruz

Lingenfelter, Barbara	California State Polytechnic College, Pomona
Linn, Ronald N.	Oakland Public Schools, Oakland
Lucas, Pat	Pepperdine College, Los Angeles
Marion, Arthur	San Fernando Valley State College, Northridge
Marks, Melvin G.	California Association for Childhood Education, La Mesa
McCarthy, William	University of California, Berkeley
McCullough, Betty	Biola College, La Mirada
McDaniel, Harold	University of Santa Clara, Santa Clara
McDonald, Gerald E.	University of Santa Clara, Santa Clara
Minnis, Douglas L.	University of California, Davis
Moore, Gilbert S.	2324 Panorama Drive, La Cresenta
Morgenroth, Edwin C.	Pacific Oaks College, Pasadena
Mother M. Guest	San Diego College for Women, San Diego
Mother C. Welch	San Francisco College for Women, San Francisco
Mother N. White	San Francisco College for Women San Francisco
Musick, James	California Industrial Education Association, Fresno
Naslund, Mildred	Los Angeles City School, Gardena
Nelson, John	University of California, Santa Barbara
Nelson, L. E.	California Baptist College, Riverside
Nordberg, Orville,	Sacramento State College, Sacramento
Newgarden, Marguerite	California State College, Los Angeles
Newman, Alfred	Vallejo Unified School Boards Association, Vallejo
Obradovich, Eli	State Department of Education, Sacramento
Osborn, Kenneth	Santa Maria Schools, Santa Maria
Page, Robert	Compton Elementary Schools, Compton
Parisi, Attilio	California School Boards Association
Parks, D. Russell	California Association of School Administrators, Fullerton
Pelton, Claire L.	Los Altos High School, Los Altos
Person, Gerald	San Diego State College, San Diego
Pitts, Raymond J.	State Department of Education, Sacramento
Pruitt, Robert	San Jose State College, San Jose
Quinlan, Frederick F.	Immaculate Heart College, Los Angeles
Rehwoldt, Walter	California Western University, San Diego
Robertson, Malcolm R.	Azusa Pacific College, Azusa
Robinson, Clark	University of California, Berkeley
Rogers, Lloyd V.	California Mathematics Council, Menlo Park
Roth, Julian B.	California State Colleges, Los Angeles
Scharer, Norman B.	Santa Barbara City Schools, Santa Barbara

Schiffilea, Doris	Mt. Saint Mary's College, Los Angeles
Schmidt, Florence	Marymount College, Palos Verdes Estates
Schroeder, Walter P.	California State Polytechnic College, San Luis Obispo
Schumann, Paul F.	Loyola University, Los Angeles
Schuyler, Arent H. Jr.	California Association of Independent Schools, Santa Barbara
Schwartz, John C.	Audio Visual Educational Association of California, Encino
Sehmann, H. R.	California State College, Long Beach
Shroff, Piroja	California College of Arts and Crafts, Oakland
Simpson, George T.	La Sierra College, Riverside
Singer, Harry	University of California, Riverside
Sister M. Jerome Hart	Immaculate Heart College, Los Angeles
Sister M. Clara	St. Joseph College, Orange
Sister M. Imelda	St. Joseph College, Orange
Sister Marie Immaculata	College of Notre Dame, Belmont
Sister Mary of St. Michael	College of the Holy Names, Oakland
Sister Paul Michael	College of the Holy Names, Oakland
Sister Rosemarie Julie	College of Notre Dame, Belmont
Snyder, Harvey B.	Pasadena College, Pasadena
Sparks, Richard K.	Fresno State College, Fresno
Stone, Dorothy W.	State Department of Education, Los Angeles
Stone, James C.	University of California, Berkeley
Strahan, Donald	Humboldt State College, Arcata
Stromgren, Rebekah	California School Boards Association, Davis
Sweeney, William G.	San Jose State College, San Jose
Tegner, Olaf	Pepperdine College, Los Angeles
Thompson, Alvin	University of California, Berkeley
Thomson, Procter	Claremont Graduate School, Claremont
Threatt, Iola	University of Redlands, Redlands
Toews, Emil O.	State Department of Education, Sacramento
Tueller, Dallas	Fresno State College, Fresno
Umbach, William E.	University of Redlands, Redlands
Vanderpool, J. Alden	California Teachers Association, Burlingame
Wagner, William S.	Association for Student Teaching, San Jose
Washington, Eva	Sonoma State College, Rohnert Park
West, Robert L.	California State College, San Bernardino
Wetherill, William	San Diego State College, San Diego
Wilson, Donald E.	University of Southern California, Los Angeles
Wolfson, Margaret	Dominican College, San Rafael
Wood, Merle D.	California Teachers Association, Bakersfield
Worthington, Frances B.	California Teachers Association, Inglewood

Young, F. Roman	Mt. Saint Mary's College, Los Angeles
Ziff, Larzer	University of California, Berkeley